

The
South Atlantic Quarterly.

Editors' Announcement

The editors of the SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY desire to express their deep appreciation of the service rendered the journal during the past three years by their predecessor, Dr. John Spencer Bassett. In his mind originated the idea of establishing it, and his patience, energy and wisdom have contributed largely to the measure of success which it has achieved. His established standing in the field of historical research guaranteed from the beginning a journal of liberal and scholarly ideals; while his wide acquaintance among investigators of historical, economic, and social questions has commanded as contributors many well trained writers. The reception of the QUARTERLY has been encouraging beyond expectation, and it has gained an established place as an organ of public opinion. It is a pleasure to announce—as it will be a pleasure for the readers of the QUARTERLY to know—that Dr. Bassett, as vice-president of the South Atlantic Publishing Company, will continue to be identified with the management of the QUARTERLY and that he will be a frequent contributor to its pages.

The South Atlantic Publishing Company—composed entirely of members of the faculties of Trinity College and of the Trinity Park School—will, as in the past, be responsible for the financial management of the magazine, thus ensuring its continuance under favorable auspices. From former contributors, as well as from other writers of ability and prominence throughout the United States, assurances have been received of timely and valuable articles. The editors earnestly invite the co-operation of all who are interested in the maintenance in the South of a periodical devoted to the candid discussion of such questions as may appear to have signal importance in our national life.

Naturally, the QUARTERLY will find its contributors, in large

part, among Southern men. It desires to be a medium of expression for a constantly increasing number of investigators and public spirited citizens who wish to write on vital subjects connected with Southern society. It would relate itself to that tendency now so marked among the younger generation of Southerners to give worthy and lasting form to their studies and investigations. The *QUARTERLY* hopes to share the results of, and at the same time to stimulate, this tendency among Southerners to give expression to their ideas. As in the past, its pages are open to men of all points of view, provided their articles are written with due attention to accuracy, good taste and literary style. The editors believe, however, that the best service that can be rendered the South today is the giving of opportunity for the writing of well-balanced and constructive criticism, as it may be applied to all phases of life.

Many intelligent Southerners have hesitated to give free expression to their opinions about Southern problems because of their dislike of publishing in Northern magazines or papers that which may, perchance, wound the feelings of the people of their own section. There has been a natural sensitiveness about any appearance of criticism from the outside rather than from an inside and sympathetic standpoint. Hence the need for the development of Southern periodicals in which Southern men may speak frankly and honestly the thing they feel. It is thus that the *QUARTERLY* hopes to attract to its columns the most thoughtful men of this section, men who will write about literary, educational, social, and religious problems without passion or prejudice, but rather with the freedom and cosmopolitanism that should characterize the cultivated man. It is frequently a complaint among the best men of the South that other sections of the country misjudge us by taking the opinions of certain public men and newspaper editors as typical of the better sentiment of the South. The fault is partly our own, in that the most thoughtful of our citizens have not given adequate and forceful expression to their points of view and have not thus become moulders of public sentiment.

While necessarily the articles in the *QUARTERLY* will be written for the most part by Southern men, the editors hope that no note of provincialism will be heard. They will do all in their power

to make the national spirit dominant. One of the editors is a Southerner—the son of a confederate soldier—related by training and sympathy with progressive forces in Southern life, and anxious above all other things to be of service to his native section. The other is a Northerner—who has become a citizen of North Carolina—earnestly desirous of sharing in sympathy and helpfulness the life and problems of the community in which he has made his home. Both are so confident of the future of the South as to feel a certain exhilaration at the prospect of what will be wrought out here within the next generation. They feel that one of the things most needed today is that the two sections may be brought to know one another and grow to be in sympathy with one another. To this end an effort will be made to manifest to Northern readers the elements in Southern life that are constructive, hopeful, and national, and to reveal to Southern readers the forces in the North that are coming to a far better understanding of Southern problems.

Much has been said of the New South. Whatever one may call it—the young South, or the present South, or “the Old South, made new by events”—it is an indubitable fact that the old order changeth, giving place to the new. Despite the forces of sectionalism, prejudice and passion, the national spirit is constantly growing here. Finding notable expression after the war in the letters of Robert E. Lee, in Lamar’s speech over the dead Sumner, in Lanier’s Centennial Cantata, and in the speeches of Henry Grady, it is now the dominant spirit among the younger men of the South, who will not have it that this is an isolated part of the nation. They share in the life of the nation at large, knowing that it is their inheritance from Washington and Marshall and Madison. This spirit is seen in industry, in education, in a growing sense of independence and freedom in politics. Though obscured now and then by waves of passion and prejudice, the national spirit in the South is an established fact and promises much for the future. The Northerner who does not reckon with it is blind to one of the most encouraging phases of contemporary American life.

There is a sense, too, in which there is a New North. The sense of nationalism has been strong there. Everything has tended to develop that spirit—victory in a great war, increasing commercial

prosperity and the continued success of a party that represents ideals of strong national government. Patriotism has been natural and yet it has frequently been a fact that, to the Northern mind, the nation meant the North and did not include the South. An intelligent Southerner who lived for several years in Cambridge, Mass., said that the average citizen of that community knew more about India than about the South. Northerners have failed to see with imagination the tragedy of the Civil War, the worse tragedy of Reconstruction, and the ever-present tragedy of two races trying to work out upon the same soil the problems of civilization. Hence they also have had a sectional feeling. All along, however, there has been a tendency in the direction of a genuine national spirit: it was in the heart of the great Lincoln when he delivered his second inaugural; it spoke in the 70's through Godkin and Carl Schurz, George William Curtis and Lowell. It received a monumental expression just the other day in President Roosevelt's address on Lincoln Day, when he said: "I believe in the Southerner, as I believe in the Northerner. I claim the right to feel a pride in his great qualities and in his great deeds, exactly as I feel pride in the great qualities and deeds of every other American. For weal or for woe we are knit together and I believe that we shall go up and not down, that we shall go forward instead of halting and falling back, because I have an abiding faith in the generosity, the courage, the resolution, and the common sense of all my countrymen."

To bring the national Southerner and the national Northerner closer together is the duty of every man who loves his country. Those who have the national spirit in both sections need each other's help in their struggle with the forces of sectionalism and prejudice. The *QUARTERLY* hopes to play a humble part in this work of bringing about a common understanding of the inherent worth and rightness of each section. There is the same spirit among those who have at heart the interest of this magazine, as was in evidence when the first editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* put the national flag on its cover.

The New North

BY HAMILTON WRIGHT MARIE

In the latest volume of his "History of the United States" Mr. James Ford Rhodes quotes these words from Col. Thomas H. Livermore, whose critical and dispassionate study of the history and statistics of the war between the States is one of the most important contributions to a knowledge of that momentous epoch: "The foregoing comparisons do not give ground on which to award the display of superior courage or steadfastness to the armies as a whole on either side. The record on both sides places the people of the United States in the first rank of militant nations." In a note of acknowledgment at the close of the volume Mr. Rhodes recognizes his indebtedness to "the unique publication, War of the Rebellion: Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies," and adds, "The acknowledgment of the War Department to the Confederate generals, to Jefferson Davis and his widow, for assistance in the collection of materials and the facts stated in connection therewith have probably no parallel in historical literature." When it is remembered that the war lasted four years, that a large section of country was swept bare not only of men and food, but of houses and tools; that the total enlistments in both armies were about four million, two hundred thousand; that a full half million men died on both sides on the field, from wounds, disease, accidents and other causes; that the total cost of the war was about \$5,000,000,000, the full significance of these statements becomes apparent. Add to these striking facts the statesmanlike attitude of General Grant in the closing hours of the struggle and the noble and far-seeing patriotism of General Lee and the real spirit in which a great conflict was conducted and ended becomes clear through clouds of misapprehension and deafening confusions of speech.

That war closed forty years ago for all save a few score politicians on both sides whose stock in trade is not new ideas and fresh perceptions of the needs of a new age, but worn-out phrases, a dying sectionalism of feeling and a perverted use of splendid traditions; and a group of men and women whose heart and

brains had been so absorbed in old-time issues that they continue to live in conditions which have disappeared. The battle flags have been exchanged; the President of the United States in public address has not only recognized the consummate courage of the men who fought against the Union, but their passionate sincerity as well; the war is finally and forever over. The day will come when statues of Lee and Stonewall Jackson will find place in the squares of Northern cities as types of ideal Americans, stainless in character, heroic in self-sacrifice, following duty with unshrinking loyalty and at an immense cost; and statues will be erected in Southern cities to Lincoln, the man of largest and tenderest heart whom the great crisis brought to the front, and the best and wisest friend of the South on either side the line. In his spirit, not in that of Stevens; in the temper of Lee, not in that of irreconcilable partisans, are to be found the soul of a heroic age and the prophetic lines of the development which was to follow the bitterness of ancient strife.

It is wise to recall these things for there is still, at times, a clamor of discordant voices from those who are in the new age but not of it, and because the heroic memories of the struggle form an inexhaustible capital of proud memories and of inspiring impulses for Americans in all time to come. It is only brave foes who can so respect one another that out of bitter strife they strike hands at last in indestructible fraternity. The conflict was sectional, the results of it are national. All honor to the men who conducted the long debate on fundamentally different ideas of the distribution of power under our system, and to the other men who lived through the sublime epic of strife or died in the throes of it; all reverence to the Grey and Blue as emblems of a kindred honesty of purpose and resolute facing of death! It is out of soil fed with such blood that great men spring and the noblest growths of national character and ideals arise.

These things are now a heritage; they belong to us as a people; what are we to do with them? To put them in a museum as in a shrine and worship them is to show them small honor; for they are not relics of a dead past; they are achievements which have created a new age; and we honor them most truly when we lift ourselves in breadth of vision and of work, to their level.

There was an Old South and there is now a New South; there

was also an Old North; it needs to be said that there is a New North. The Old North and the Old South were separated by radical differences of opinion and by deep and tragic ignorance; they drifted apart as the result of divergent conditions which they very imperfectly recognized, and when the crisis was upon them they underestimated alike the intensity of honest conviction and the resources of the two sections. Provincial America had expanded into Sectional America without any clear consciousness of the significance of the process, and Sectional America has now become a nation in the full, rich meaning of the word; and the New South and the New North are made up of the men and women who understand the significance of this tremendous growth and are determined to think and act in the light of it. These men and women, cherishing in equal honor the high memories of the days when their fathers lived apart, have been drawn together, not by the watch words of the fathers but by their spirit; and, above all, by their immense bequest of heroic service. The more rapidly and completely they can dispel the last lingering mist of misunderstanding and the more rapidly they can bring in clear knowledge, the more vital and fruitful will be the progress of the real reconstruction which has succeeded the anarchy and confusion of a reconstruction planned on sectional instead of national lines.

The New South has had much to unlearn and to learn, and so has the New North. A more radical reversal of opinion and feeling on many points than that which has taken place in the North during the past decade is hardly afforded in any other period or section. It would be easy to point out the changes of mind and heart in the South, but that has been done again and again; the country understands in a superficial way at least what the New South stands for. It does not, however, clearly understand that there is a New North and what the New North stands for.

It stands, in the first place, for a complete, honest, and sincere recognition that the Old South was as high-minded, disinterested, and conscientious as the Old North; that what it believed it believed with kindred integrity of conscience and fought for with a courage, self-sacrifice, and at a loss equalled probably, in range and magnitude, only by the courage, self-sacrifice, and loss of the

people of the Low Countries in their magnificent struggle against Spain.

It believes, in the second place, that on the great question of the relative powers of the nation and of the States the Old South was technically right, though historically wrong; that Calhoun's argument, on strictly technical grounds, was unanswerable. In the great debate Hayne spoke authoritatively for the framers of the constitution, while Webster spoke authoritatively for the necessities of the nation.

It recognizes, in the third place, that the initial responsibility for slavery was shared by the North and South alike, and that in the earlier stages of colonial development, slavery disappeared from the North and strengthened its hold in the South as the result of circumstances rather than of moral repugnance; and it sees with increasing clearness that to the isolation of the South, logically brought about by slavery, was largely due the arrest of the normal movement of the Southern mind, which, from the start, revealed a notable aptitude for dealing with public affairs in a large and statesmanlike spirit.

It recognizes, in the fourth place, that the policy of reconstruction which subverted the order of society in the South and placed the duties of citizenship on the negro without educating him to bear them was a blunder of tragic magnitude and a gross injustice to white and black alike; that to set in inevitable antagonism a class of men with fifteen hundred years of political education behind them and a class of men who had not learned the rudiments of that education was to invite the bitter and humiliating experience through which the South passed at the close of the war. It believes there were great and serious mistakes on both sides, but it regards those mistakes as part of the old misunderstanding which made Sectional America possible. The New North does not believe that the door of citizenship should be closed in any man's face because of race or color; but it also believes that all the conditions of citizenship, save this, belong to the States for settlement; that the South should decide for itself the conditions precedent to the granting of the franchise; that the South understands, as the North does not and cannot, the actual conditions under which this problem must be worked out; and that what the South needs from the North is the patience which

is born of knowledge, the sympathy which comes from an old and common responsibility, and the coöperation which is the fruit of faith.

The men and women of the New North recognize, finally, the full co-partnership of the South with the North in the shaping of the early history of the nation and the preponderance of Southern men among the early leaders; they honor the breadth and quality of educational work in the Old, and the inspiring leadership in educational activity and interest in the New South; they are as deeply interested in the early story of William and Mary, as in that of Harvard, Yale and Princeton; they accept at their full value the great achievements and services of the University of Virginia, one of the pioneers of university methods and training in this country; they know the solid and high-class work of such State institutions as the Universities of North Carolina, and Georgia, and Texas; they hold in high regard the long line of Southern colleges like Wofford and Randolph-Macon, which with small means and at great sacrifices, have held fast by the traditions of sound learning; and they are quick to honor Trinity, Vanderbilt, the University of Tennessee, the University of the South, which have set a new pace for educational progress in the South during the last fifteen years. They regard the rising tide of intellectual and educational interest in the South as one of the foremost movements of progress in American life, of equal importance to all sections of the nation.

The men and women of the New North have long been readers of Southern books and have not been slow to perceive that in Mr. James Lane Allen, Mr. Thomas Nelson Page, Mr. Joel Chandler Harris, Mr. John Fox, Jr., Miss Glasgow, Miss King—to select a few representative novelists—the New South holds a foremost place in later American writing. They long ago recognized the genius of Poe and appraised his rare and subtle work by national instead of sectional standards; they know the lyrics of Timrod, of Hayne, of Thompson, of Dr. Ticknor, of Father Ryan, of Cooke, of Hope and of Mrs. Preston; they are students of Lanier, whose achievement and career were on a level; and they are aware of those special qualities, gifts and capacities which the South alone can contribute to a literature which would be impoverished without the love of song for its own sake, the

power and freedom of emotion, the lyrical *abandon* and spontaneity which are the prime poetic gifts of the South.

With entire loyalty to its past and to the men and women who made that past articulate and commanding, the men and women of the New North have traveled so far out of sectionalism and into nationalism.

They hold the traditions sacred, but they feel the air of a new age, they live in the light of a nobler conception of what is and must be the work of the nation in the spiritual life of the world. They discard sectional valuations of political ideas, of scholarly standards, of literary achievement. They ask no immunity from the most searching criticism so long as it is just; they must have unfettered freedom of thought and of speech in religious and political discussion; their allegiance must be to the truth, not to formulas of their State or of their section; they are Americans to the heart, but they mean also to be citizens of that great community of the nations fast organizing itself as the ultimate unit of society. To this common ground the men and women of the New South and the New North are coming that they may plant the nation, prepared alike in the Old North and the Old South, on immovable foundations of righteousness, of mutual comprehension and sympathy, of fellowship in the faith of the fathers for the service of humanity.

Sidney Lanier: Reminiscences and Letters

BY DANIEL COIT GILMAN,

Ex-President of Johns Hopkins University

Five years before his death, to the surprise of many, Sidney Lanier was selected as the poet who should write a cantata for the opening of the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition. Before that time two of his longest and most highly finished poems, "Corn" and the "Symphony" had been printed in *Lippincott's Magazine*, nevertheless his fame was still so limited that the literary world did not know what to make of his nomination. Why was a confederate soldier preferred to a defender of the Union? Why should an unknown poet be selected from Baltimore, when other cities had their favorite famous sons,—New York her Bryant, Philadelphia her Boker, and Boston her famous trio? If a young man were to be chosen how did it happen that the lot should fall upon Sidney Lanier, not on Stedman, nor Gilder, nor on that gifted man of kindred soul, the California Sill? The answer was that Bayard Taylor proposed him and Bayard Taylor was a good critic. The questioner continued, "And why did Bayard Taylor name him?" The answer to this query was not obvious even when the Centennial Ode was printed in the newspapers long before the day of celebration. Its publication, says his biographer, Dr. Ward, "was the occasion of an immense amount of ridicule, more or less good humored." The author was pained by the criticism but his faith in his ideals of art remained unshaken.

As a Baltimorean who had just formed the acquaintance of Lanier, (both of us being strangers at that time in a city which we came to love as a most hospitable and responsive home,) I was much interested in his appointment. It was then true, though Dr. Holmes had not yet said it, that Baltimore had produced three poems, each of them the best of its kind: "The Star Spangled Banner" of Key, the "Raven" of Poe, and "Maryland, my Maryland," by Randall. Was it to produce a fourth poem as remarkable as these? Lanier's "Cantata" appeared in one of the daily journals, prematurely. I read it as one reads news-

paper articles, with a rapid glance, and could make no sense of it. Rhyme without reason, I would not say, but certainly words without sentences. I heard the comments of other bewildered critics. I read the piece again and again before the meaning began to dawn on me. Soon afterwards, Lanier's own explanation appeared and the Dawn became Daylight. The ode was not written "to be read." It was to be sung,—and sung not by a single voice, with a piano accompaniment, but in the open air, by a chorus of many hundred voices and with the accompaniment of a majestic orchestra, to music especially written for it by a composer of great distinction. The critical test would be its rendition. From this point of view the Cantata must be judged.

I remember well the day of trial. The President of the United States, the Emperor of Brazil, the Governors of States, the judges of the highest courts, the chief military and naval heroes were seated on the platform in the face of an immense assembly. There was no pictorial effect in the way they were grouped. They were a mass of living beings, a crowd of black-coated dignitaries, not arranged in any impressive order. No Cathedral of Canterbury, no Sanders Hall, no episcopal or academic gowns. The oratory was likewise ineffective. There were loud voices and vigorous gestures, but none of the eloquence which enchants a multitude. The devotional exercises awakened no sentiment of reverence. At length came the Cantata. From the overture to the closing cadence it held the attention of the vast throng of listeners, and when it was concluded loud applause rung through the air. A noble conception had been nobly rendered. Words and music, voices and instruments, produced an impression as remarkable as the rendering of the Hallelujah Chorus in the nave of Westminster Abbey. Lanier had triumphed. It was an opportunity of a lifetime to test upon a grand scale his theory of verse. He came off victorious.

Several months after the Centennial exercises I received a letter from Lanier inquiring as to the opportunity offered by Johns Hopkins University—then recently opened—to "those prosecuting original researches in science." This led to an interview in which plans for a chair of Music and Poetry at the University were discussed.* I was anxious to have him appointed to such a chair, but

*See Letters of Sidney Lanier, p. 30.

the trustees did not see their way to do so. A year later I received the following letter written just after his failure to secure a clerkship in Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Sept. 26, 1877.

DEAR MR. GILMAN:—From a published report of your very interesting address I learn that there is now a vacant Fellowship. Would I be able to discharge the duties of such a position?

My course of study would be: first, constant research in the physics of musical tone; second, several years' devotion to the acquirement of a thoroughly scientific *general* view of Mineralogy, Botany and Comparative Anatomy; third, French and German Literature. I fear this may seem a nondescript and even flighty process; but it makes straight towards this final result of all my present thought, and I am tempted, by your great kindness, to believe that you would have confidence enough in me to await whatever development should come of it.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY LANIER.

It was not deemed advisable to award him the Fellowship. During the winter of 1877-'78 he became interested in the study of early English literature, delivering a series of lectures thereon at Mrs. Edgeworth Bird's in Baltimore. The lectures attracted attention as did those delivered the following year at Peabody Institute. On February 3, 1879, his thirty-seventh birthday, I notified him of his appointment to a lectureship in English Literature in the University. The letter here given is a full discussion of his plans and ideals with regard to his work:

180 St. Paul Street, BALTIMORE, Md., July 13, 1879.

MY DEAR MR. GILMAN:—I see, from your letter, that I did not clearly explain my scheme of lectures.

The course marked "Class Lectures" is meant for advanced students, and involves the hardest kind of university work on their part. Perhaps you will best understand the scope of the tasks which this course will set before the student by reading the enclosed *theses* which I should distribute among the members of the class as soon as I should have discovered their mental leanings and capacities sufficiently, and which I should require to be worked out by the end of the scholastic year. I beg you to read these with some care: I send only seven of them but they will be sufficient to show you the nature of the work which I propose to do with the *University student*. I should like my main efforts to take that direction, I wish to get some Americans at hard work in pure literature; and will be glad if the public lectures in Hopkins Hall shall be merely accessory to my main course. With this view, as you look over the accompanying theses please observe:

(1.) That each of these involves original research and will—if properly carried out—constitute a genuine contribution to modern literary scholarship;

(2.) That they are so arranged as to fall in with various other studies and extend their range,—for example, the first one being suitable to a student of philosophy who is pursuing Anglo-Saxon, the second to one who is studying the Transition Period of English, the sixth to one who is studying Elizabethan English, and so on;

(3.) That each one necessitates diligent study of some great English work, not as a philological collection of words, but as pure literature; and

(4.) That they keep steadily in view, as their ultimate object, that strengthening of manhood, that enlarging of sympathy, that glorifying of moral purpose, which the student unconsciously gains, not from any direct didacticism, but from this constant association with our finest ideals and loftiest souls.

Thus you see that while the course of "Class Lectures" submitted to you nominally centers about the three plays of Shakspeare* therein named, it really takes these for texts, and involves, in the way of commentary and of thesis the whole range of English poetry. In fact I have designed it as a thorough preparation for the serious study of the poetic art in its whole outcome, hoping that, if I should carry it out successfully, the Trustees might find it wise next year to create either a Chair of Poetry or a permanent lectureship covering the field above indicated. It is my fervent belief that to take classes of young men and to preach them the gospel according-to-Poety is to fill the most serious gap in our system of higher education; I think one can already perceive a certain narrowing of sympathy and—what is even worse—an unsymmetric development of faculty, both intellectual and moral, from a too exclusive devotion to Science which Science itself would be the first to condemn.

As to the first six class-lectures on "The Physics and Metaphysics of Poetry:" they unfold my system of English Prosody, in which I should thoroughly drill every student until he should be able to note down, in musical signs, the rhythm of any English poem. This drilling would continue through the whole course, inasmuch as I regard a mastery of the principles set forth in those lectures as vitally important to all systematic progress in the understanding and enjoyment of poetry.

I should have added, apropos of this Class-course, that there ought to be one examination each week, to every two lectures.

In the first interview we had, after my appointment, it was your intention to place this study among those required by the University for a Degree. I hope sincerely you have not abandoned this idea; and the course outlined in "Class-lectures" forwarded to you the other day and in the theses of which I send the first seven herewith seems to me the best to begin with. If it should be made a part of the "Major Course in Eng-

*Midsummer Night's Dream, Hamlet and The Tempest.

lish" (where it seems properly to belong,) I could easily arrange a simpler and less arduous modification of it for the corresponding "Minor Course."

I am so deeply interested in this matter—of making a finer fibre for all our young American manhood by leading our youth in proper relations with English poetry—that at the risk of consuming your whole vacation with reading this long and unconscionable letter I will mention that I have nearly completed three works which are addressed to the practical accomplishment of the object named, by supplying a wholly different method of study from that mischievous one which has generally arisen from a wholly mistaken use of the numerous "Manuals" of English literature. These works are my three text-books: (1). *The Science of English Verse*, in which the student's path is cleared of a thousand errors and confusions which have obstructed this study for a long time, by a very simple system founded upon the physical relations of sound; (2) *From Cædmon to Chaucer*, in which I present all the most interesting Anglo-Saxon poems remaining to us, in a form which renders their literary quality appreciable by all students, whether specially pursuing Old English or not, thus placing these poems where they ought always to have stood—as a sort of grand and simple vestibule through which the later mass of English poetry is to be approached; and (3) my *Chaucer*, which I render immediately enjoyable, without preliminary preparation, by an interlined glossarial explanation of the original text, and an indication (with hyphens) of those terminal syllables affecting the rhythm which have decayed out of the modern tongue. I am going to print these books and sell them myself, on the cheap plan which has been so successfully adopted by Edward Arber, lecturer on English literature in University College, London. I have been working on them for two months; in two more they will be finished; and by the middle of November I hope to have them ready for use as text-books. If they succeed, I shall complete the series next year with (4) a *Spenser* on the same plan with the Chaucer, (5) *The Minor Elizabethan Song-Writers*, and (6) *The Minor Elizabethan Dramatists*; the steady aim of the whole being to furnish a working set of books which will familiarize the student with the actual works of English poets, rather than with their names and biographers.

Pray forgive this merciless letter. I could not resist the temptation to unfold to you all my hopes and plans connected with my university-work among your men which I so eagerly anticipate.

I will trouble you to return these notes of theses when you have examined them at leisure.

Faithfully yours,

SIDNEY LANIER.

After getting well into his work he wrote me, the following spring, a letter suggesting a course in writing for the undergraduates:

435 N. Calvert Street, BALTIMORE, March 16, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR:—It has several times occurred to me to ask if I might not be of further service to you in providing instruction for the *undergraduates* of our Collegiate Department in Rhetoric, Sentence-building, English Composition, Punctuation, and the like, with practical exercises in Essay-writing. I believe this forms part of the "Course" in every college: and I have recently seen some shrewd strokes at Harvard for turning out graduates who could not write a passable English letter. All the instruction in my special line, so far, has been quite advanced.

Perhaps I should report that I gave the last of my first series of ten readings on Monday night; and that I had a pleasant meeting with the Science-class yesterday afternoon at four, in Professor Morris's room.

Faithfully yours,

SIDNEY LANIER.

There are other letters which give his suggestions as to courses of study. These are enough, however, to show the conscientiousness and enthusiasm which characterized his work. He was very successful in inspiring and instructing those who came within sound of his voice.

The appearance of Lanier was striking. There was nothing eccentric or odd about him, but his looks, manners, ways of speech had distinction. I have heard a lady say that if he took his place in a crowded horse-car, an exhilarating atmosphere seemed to be introduced by his breezy ways. He was not far from five feet ten inches in height, slight in figure, with jet black hair, pallid complexion, bright restless eyes and a long flowing beard which gracefully fell upon his breast. His motions were alert and nervous, his speech gentle and refined, his dress careful and his gloves of the nicest fit, but there was nothing finical in all this, not even the suspicion of Bohemia, and in the days of his greatest need, he was always a gentleman in appearance and dress. This is an inadequate description for it does not portray that rare combination of gentleness and intellectual brightness or that sunshiny and sympathetic smile which illuminated his face. I have listened to many comments upon his bust, as it stands in the Johns Hopkins University Hall. One said, "He looks like Moses;" another, "He looks like Christ." A German physiologist simply said "Tuberculosis."

The last time that I saw Lanier was in the spring of 1881, when after a winter of severe illness, he came to make arrangements for his lectures of the next winter and to say good-bye for

the summer. His emaciated form could scarcely walk across the yard from the carriage to the door. "I am going to Asheville, N. C.," he said, "and I am going to write an account of that region as a railroad guide. It seems as if the Good Lord always took care of me. Just as the doctors had said that I must go to that mountain region the publishers gave me a commission to prepare a book." "Good-bye," he added, and I supported his tottering steps to the carriage door, never to see his face again.

He always preserved his sweetness of disposition, his cheerfulness, his courtesy, his industry, his hope, his ambition. Like a true knight errant, never disheartened by difficulty, never despondent in the face of danger, always brave, full of resources, confident of ultimate triumph. One of his own poems, "Life and Song," is a picture of his inner life; its closing couplet might be his epitaph:

His song was only living aloud;
His work, a singing with his hand.

Through the summer he struggled for recovery. "Never think I shall die," he said to his wife. "Give me a stimulant to bring me back when you see me fail." She did this more than once, but at last when she offered him a drop of cordial, he gasped, "I can't," and his brave soul fled. "*Aspiro dum expiro*" were the words we placed upon a memorial brass in the hall where he had lectured, and on the card of invitation which brought his friends together to celebrate his forty-sixth birthday, Mrs. Whitman printed for us the words which concluded his last poem.

Seven years after his death a bust of Sidney Lanier in bronze was given to the Johns Hopkins University. The hall was filled with a company of those who knew and admired him. On the pedestal which supported the bust, hung his flute and a roll of his music; a garland of laurels crowned his brow, and the sweetest of flowers were strewn at his feet. Letters came from Lowell, Holmes, Gilder, Stedman; young men who never saw him, but who had come under his influence, read their tributes in verse; a former student of the university, Albert H. Tolman, made a critical estimate of the "Science of English Verse;" a lady read several of Lanier's own poems; another lady sang one of his musical compositions, adapted to words of Tennyson, and another song of his

to which some one else wrote the music; a college president of New Jersey held up Lanier as a teacher of ethics; but the most striking figure was the trim, gaunt form of a Catholic priest—Father Tabb—who referred to the day when they, two confederate soldiers, (the Huguenot and the Catholic) were confined in the union prison, and with tears in his eyes said, his love for Lanier was like that of David for Jonathan. Sweetest of all the testimonials came at the very last moment, unsolicited and unexpected, from that charming poetess, Edith Thomas. She heard of the memorial assembly and on the spur of the moment wrote her well-known lines, suggested by one of Lanier's own verses.

The Hague Court

BY JOHN H. LATANE, PH. D.,

Professor of History in Washington and Lee University

The principle of international arbitration has received wide recognition in the past few years. In spite of recent wars there has developed among the peoples of the earth a strong undercurrent of sentiment in favor of peace, and during the past twelve months this sentiment has manifested itself to an extraordinary degree in what is now commonly called the world's peace movement. From pulpit and press, from philanthropic associations, from conferences of lawyers and publicists, national and international, the demand has come for the peaceful adjustment of international disputes, and this demand has been met by the negotiation of arbitration treaties, a score or more of which have already been entered into by the leading powers of the world. This subject is of special interest to Americans on account of the frequent recourse that has been had to arbitration by the nations on this continent. No country has done more to encourage this method of procedure in the settlement of international differences than the United States. The greatest triumph of the principle was the reference by England and the United States after the civil war of the so-called Alabama Claims to a special court of arbitration convened at Geneva. The award of the Geneva tribunal, though galling to England, was accepted without question, and the two great branches of the English-speaking race thus set an example of incalculable value.

It is rather difficult to determine the exact number of cases that have been submitted to arbitration before specially constituted courts during the past hundred years, but a recent writer on the subject gives the following interesting data, which seem to be approximately correct:* Between 1794 and 1820 there were 15 cases of arbitration; between 1821 and 1840, 8; between 1841 and 1860, 20; between 1861 and 1880, 44; and between 1881 and 1900, 90. By states the record is as follows: Great Britain

*La Fontaine: *Histoire Documentaires des Arbitrages Internationaux*: Berne, 1902.

has been a party to 70 arbitrations, the United States to 56, Chili to 26, France to 26, Peru to 14, Portugal to 12, Brazil to 11, Argentina to 10, Spain to 10, and several other states have resorted to arbitration in a smaller number of instances. It is interesting to note that Russia has been a party to only four arbitrations, Austria to only two, and Germany to none until the recent Venezuelan case.

All these cases have been submitted to special courts of arbitration-organized for the occasion, each resting on a special treaty of a temporary character, and each tribunal adopting its own rules of procedure. The organization of temporary special tribunals under special treaties involves unnecessary delay and expense, and it has long been held by the friends and advocates of arbitration that the ever-increasing number of cases submitted to this method of settlement justified some more permanent arrangement. It was with this view that a permanent arbitration treaty between England and the United States was negotiated by Mr. Olney and Lord Pauncefote and submitted by President Cleveland to the Senate in January, 1897. But the Senate unfortunately rejected the treaty, it lacking only two of the necessary two-thirds vote. A year later, however, the Czar of Russia issued his call for the Peace Conference, which resulted in the adoption by all of the powers represented of the Convention for the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences. This treaty is a fundamental code or constitution creating a permanent court and making definite provision for the procedure in any cases that the signatory powers may see fit to bring before it.

Few events of modern times have been the subject of greater misapprehension on the part of the general public than the Peace Conference which met at the Hague in 1899. Even at this time comparatively few people are intelligently informed as to what was actually accomplished there. The Czar's note calling the Conference defined its objects as the promotion of international peace and the possible limitation of excessive armaments. The press of Europe at once characterized the proposed gathering of diplomats as the "Disarmament Conference," and its attitude was anything but friendly and helpful. This attitude was not changed even after the Conference met and settled down to serious work. In a meeting of European diplomats it was unfortunately

considered necessary to rigidly exclude all press representatives, but the disadvantages of this situation might have been at least partly obviated had not certain members of the Conference displayed a distinctly hostile spirit toward the press. The result was that when it became evident that the subject of disarmament could not even be discussed by the Conference, the majority of the press representatives left The Hague and declared the Conference a failure. Henceforth the public was furnished with vague or inaccurate reports from unreliable sources. The misapprehension thus arising as to the real object of the Conference was further strengthened by the fact that several of the powers represented were soon engaged in bloody wars. The public not unnaturally adopted the view that the whole movement was a failure. Many newspapers continue to hold this view, and the subject still affords a wide target for the derisive shafts of cartoonists. It would be difficult to find an illustrated paper in which the Peace Conference is not continually held up to ridicule.

The question as to what powers should be invited to participate in the Conference was a difficult one for the Russian Government to decide, but invitations were finally extended to all governments having regular diplomatic representation at St. Petersburg. This excluded the South African Republics with the embarrassing question as to their status then pending with England, as well as the Pope with his claim to temporal power. An unfortunate omission was that of the South and Central American states, but no exception could be made in their case. The United States and Mexico were thus the only American states represented. This does not mean that the other American republics are debarred from access to The Hague Court. The Venezuelan case was carried there in 1903, and it is probable that at the next conference the other American states will be admitted as signatory powers. At the Pan-American Conference of 1901, held in the City of Mexico, a resolution was adopted declaring that the three conventions adopted at The Hague should be regarded as American public law.

There were twenty-five states represented at The Hague Conference and the total number of delegates happened to be one hundred, all of whom were present at the opening exercises. The seats were allotted to the powers in alphabetical order in the

French language, and the United States of America having been classified as "Amerique" shared with Germany (Allemagne) the seats of honor directly in front of the chair. Mr. Holls, the historian of the Conference, tells us that Count Münster jokingly referred to this arrangement as a part of the new "imperialistic" policy of the United States. On being assured by the American representatives that they were innocent of all complicity in this matter, he shook his head and smilingly replied, "American innocence is generally your excuse, and has always been a drawing card in diplomacy." The United States was represented at the Conference by Andrew D. White, Seth Low, Stanford Newel, Captain A. T. Mahan, Captain William Crozier, and Frederick William Holls, as Secretary and Counsel. The other nations sent men of equal standing, statesmen, diplomats, jurists, and soldiers. Throughout its sittings the proceedings of the Conference were marked by straightforwardness and simplicity. There was an entire absence of ostentatious display. While the Conference discussed a number of questions of grave international import and adopted conventions concerning the rules of war by land and of maritime warfare, its great work was the establishment of a permanent international court of arbitration. The Convention making provision for this Court is the Magna Charta of International Law.*

The Convention for the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences offers three methods of settlement without resort to war: (1) Through good offices and mediation; (2) Through International Commissions of Inquiry, and (3) By submission to the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

The tender and use of good offices and mediation is nothing new in international relations, but hitherto powers who have not been directly concerned in a dispute have usually refrained from offering mediation unless they had received some intimation that it would be acceptable. The Hague Convention gives the signatory powers the right to make the offer and declares that the exercise of the right shall never be regarded as an unfriendly act. Good offices and mediation have exclusively the

*Holls: *The Peace Conference at the Hague*: (The Macmillan Co., 1900.) A general reference is here made to this work, which is the recognized authority, a veritable Madison's Journal.

character of advice, and never have binding force. It is provided that, "In case of a serious difference endangering the peace, the States at variance shall each choose a Power, to whom they entrust the mission of entering into direct communication with the Power chosen on the other side, with the object of preventing the rupture of pacific relations. During the period of this mandate, the term of which, unless otherwise stipulated, cannot exceed thirty days, the states in conflict shall cease from all direct communication on the subject of the dispute, which is regarded as having been referred exclusively to the mediating powers, who shall use their best efforts to settle the controversy." It will be observed that this method is similar in all respects to that formerly employed in the settlement of affairs of honor between gentlemen.

International Commissions of Inquiry are recommended by the Convention "in differences of an international nature involving neither honor nor vital interests, and arising from a difference of of opinion on matter of fact." Such commissions shall be constituted by a special agreement between the parties to the controversy, and the agreement shall specify the facts to be examined and the extent of the powers of the commissioners. The report of a commission shall be limited to a statement of the facts, and shall in no way have the character of an arbitral award. It leaves the parties free to act on the facts after they shall have been ascertained. Probably no act of the Peace Conference will prove of greater efficacy in the immediate future than this provision for international commissions of inquiry. In times of sudden national excitement the value of a moment gained is incalculable. This provision of the treaty has just been invoked by Russia and Great Britain with a view to an amicable adjustment of the North Sea incident. According to the terms of the agreement the commission was organized as follows: England, Russia, France, and the United States were each to name one member of the commission and these four were to select a fifth. The United States appointed Rear Admiral Davis; France, Admiral Fournier; England, Admiral Beaumont; and Russia, Admiral Kaznakov. At the first meeting of the commission at Paris, December 22, Admiral von Spaun of Austria was chosen as the fifth member, and Admiral Fournier was made president. Early in January

Admiral Kaznakov retired from the commission on account of ill-health and Vice-Admiral Dubassov was appointed in his place. The findings of the commission, which were announced February 25, were in the nature of a compromise, as the majority approved the British contention that there were no torpedo boats among the fishing vessels or in their neighborhood, and therefore that Admiral Rojestvensky was not justified in opening fire, and the majority also approved the Russian contention that Admiral Rojestvensky acted according to his belief, even though mistaken, and that therefore his action did not reflect upon his military valor or sentiments of humanity. In substance the decision is not so much of a compromise as it appears on its face. It should be noted that while no direct censure was passed upon the Russian Admiral as far as his motives were concerned, yet Russia was by no means relieved of responsibility for the incident. The work of the commissioners was done when they ascertained the facts. The British Government will now demand of Russia the indemnity which she thinks those facts warrant and Russia will doubtless meet the demand by a prompt acquiescence.

By far the most important act of the Peace Conference was the establishment of the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague. There was at the outset some doubt as to whether the provisions of the convention for arbitration should be carried out by special tribunals or by a permanent court. The United States was from the first in favor of a permanent court, but the honor of first proposing a definite scheme for such a court fell to Lord Pauncefote, the chairman of the British delegation, and he became its special champion in the deliberations that ensued. This scheme was antagonized by Germany, but the sentiment of the other delegates was so strongly in favor of it that the German representatives, after consulting their government, finally agreed to the Convention.

The Hague Court consists of a large body of judges, each of the signatory powers being allowed to appoint as many as four. The appointments are made for a term of six years and the appointees must be "persons of recognized competence in questions of international law, enjoying the highest moral reputation." The judges so appointed constitute a Permanent Court of Arbi-

tration, but they do not sit as a collective body, and do not receive pay unless called upon to serve. When two or more nations have a case to submit to arbitration they select the arbitrators for the special tribunal from the general list or panel of the Court. They may select any number they choose, but if the tribunal be not constituted by special agreement of the parties, it shall be formed in the following manner: Each party shall name two arbitrators, and these together shall choose an umpire. The members of the Court in the discharge of their duties and outside of their own country shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities. The Court shall ordinarily sit at The Hague, but the place of session may with the assent of the parties be changed.

The Convention also establishes an International Bureau at The Hague to serve as a record office for the Court, as well as a permanent administrative Council composed of the diplomatic representatives of the signatory powers at The Hague, and of the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs, who shall act as president. This Council is charged with the organization, direction, and control of the Bureau. It appoints the officials of the Bureau, fixes their salaries, and controls the general expenditure. The expense of the Bureau is borne by the signatory powers in the proportion established for the bureau of the International Postal Union. The expenses of each case submitted are borne by the parties to the suit. Arbitration is in no case compulsory. It is purely facultative. There is in the treaty no limitation as to the class of cases that may be submitted to arbitration, but it declares that this method of settlement is particularly applicable to questions of a judicial nature and especially to questions regarding the interpretation or application of international treaties and conventions. Article XXXI provides: "The powers which resort to arbitration shall sign a special act (*compromis*), in which the subject of the difference shall be precisely defined, as well as the extent of the powers of the arbitrators. This act implies an agreement by each party to submit in good faith to the award."

The Arbitration Convention was signed July 29, 1899, by the representatives of sixteen powers. It was later signed and ratified by all the powers represented at the Hague Conference.

The United States Senate ratified it unanimously, February 5, 1900. On September 4, 1900, the solemn deposit of the ratifications took place in the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs at The Hague, and the powers soon announced their appointments to the Court. President McKinley appointed as the American members, November 24, 1900: Ex-President Benjamin Harrison, Chief Justice Melville Fuller, Attorney-General John W. Griggs, and Justice George Gray. Ex-President Cleveland was offered a place, but declined. After the death of ex-President Harrison, Mr. Oscar S. Straus, former minister to Constantinople, was appointed a member of the Court.

On October 7, 1903, Andrew Carnegie gave the sum of \$1,500,000 for the purpose of building, establishing, and maintaining at The Hague a Court House and Library (Temple of Peace) as a permanent home for the Court. It is to be hoped that this building will stand for ages as the donor's most enduring monument. Already the Court has surpassed the most sanguine expectations of its advocates. When the Conference adjourned the opinion was expressed in many quarters that the treaty was visionary and utopian and that the provisions for the permanent Court would soon lapse for want of litigants, but this view proved erroneous. The Court opened its first session September 15, 1902, to hear the case of the United States vs. Mexico in the matter of the Pious Fund of the Californias. A longer time than this elapsed after the organization of the Supreme Court of the United States before it was resorted to by litigants. Eighteen months later the Venezuelan case was heard, and the third case is now in process of submission. No better idea of the efficiency and value of the Court can be obtained than by a review of these cases.*

The so-called "Pious Fund of the Californias" dates back to the year 1697, when members of the Jesuit order undertook the conversion of the Indians of the Californias and began to collect contributions for this purpose. In the course of a century this sum grew to over a million dollars. After the expulsion of the Jesuits from his dominions the King of Spain acted as trustee,

*An interesting discussion of recent phases of the subject of arbitration is to be found in John W. Foster's *Arbitration and the Hague Court* (Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1904).

and when Mexico declared her independence of Spain the Mexican Government undertook the management of the fund for the pious uses intended by its founders. In 1842 the real estate and other property of the fund was sold by decree of the Mexican government and the proceeds paid into the national treasury, the government at the same time acknowledging an indebtedness of 6 per cent. per annum on the total proceeds of the sale. After the purchase of Upper California by the United States in 1848, Mexico failed to pay any part of the income to the bishops of Upper California, who finally brought their case before the claims commission organized under the treaty of 1868. The umpire, Sir Edward Thornton, to whom the case was finally referred, gave judgment in favor of the claimants, and Mexico paid the amount of the award, but failed to keep up the interest for the future. In 1891 the State Department finally took up the matter of the claim for interest which had accrued since 1869, and on May 22, 1902, Mexico signed an agreement with the United States submitting the question to the Hague Court. In this agreement the tribunal was given power to determine:

"1. If said claim, as a consequence of the former decision, is within the governing principle of *res judicata*, and

"2. If not, whether the same be just; and to render such judgment and award as may be meet and proper under all the circumstances of the case."

The United States selected from the general list of judges as its nominees for the special tribunal Prof. F. de Martens, of Russia, and Right Hon. Sir Edward Fry, of England; while Mexico named Mr. T. M. C. Asser and Jonkheer A. F. de Savornin Lohman, both of Holland. These four gentlemen met at The Hague September 1, 1902, and chose as the fifth member and president of the tribunal Prof. Henning Matzen, of Copenhagen. The United States was represented by the following counsel: William L. Penfield, Solicitor of the State Department; Senator Stewart, Chevalier Deschamps, a Senator of Belgium; Charles J. Kappler, W. T. S. Doyle, Garrett W. MacEnerney, and Jackson H. Ralston as Agent. The official language of the tribunal was French—that is, the minutes of the proceedings and the award are in that language; but as all of the arbitrators were familiar with both French and English, the right was extended to the

representatives of the United States to address the court in English.

The main point argued was as to whether the decision of the mixed commission organized under the treaty of 1868 should be given the effect of *res judicata*. The Mexican Government took the position that under the terms of that treaty the mixed commission was to determine claims that had arisen between 1848 and 1868; that the interest which had accrued since 1868 was in the nature of a new claim and therefore could not be considered to have been adjudicated upon in the former decision. Of course, Mexico's object was to secure a rehearing of the whole case on its merits. The merits of the case were discussed at some length, Mexico maintaining that the fund had been nationalized and was subject to the laws of Mexico and that the claimants could not seek redress outside of the courts of Mexico; that the right to claim further payment of the interest had expired by Mexican statute of limitations. They further claimed that the fund was established for the conversion of the Indians and that there were no longer any Indians to be converted in California.

The tribunal decided the case in favor of the United States. The judges ruled that the principle of *res judicata* applies not only to the judgments of tribunals created by the state, but equally to arbitral sentences rendered within the limits of the jurisdiction fixed by the agreement; that in the case before them there was not only identity of parties to the suit, but also identity of subject matter, compared with the sentence of Sir Edward Thornton. The claim of the United States for payment in gold was, however, disallowed. The Court held that the decision of Sir Edward Thornton on this point did not have the force of *res judicata* except for the twenty-one years' interest due at that time. The final award was as follows: "The Government of the Republic of the United Mexican States shall pay to the Government of the United States of America on February 2, 1903, and each year following on the same date of February 2, perpetually, the annuity of \$43,050.99 Mexican, in money having legal currency in Mexico." The sessions of the Court for the hearing of arguments in this case extended over ten days, and the printed report of the American agent fills 891 pages.* The decision was rendered Octo-

*Appendix II, Foreign Relations, 1902.

ber 14, 1902. The five judges received \$5,000 each for their services.

The facts in the celebrated Venezuelan case may be summarized as follows:

(1) Germany, Great Britain and Italy formed an alliance, and in December, 1902, blockaded the ports of Venezuela, in order to force a settlement of claims alleged to be due their subjects.

(2) The United States intervened diplomatically and secured an agreement in which Venezuela recognized the justice of a part of the claims and promised to set aside thirty per cent. of her customs receipt for their payment, the powers, on the other hand, agreeing to submit their claims to the arbitration of mixed commissions.

(3) The situation was, however, further complicated by the demand of the blockading powers that the sums ascertained by the mixed commissions to be due them should be paid in full before anything was paid upon the claims of the peace powers.

(4) Venezuela insisted that all her creditors should be treated alike, and President Roosevelt suggested to the powers that their demand for preferential treatment be submitted to arbitration. The powers replied by asking him to act as arbitrator. This President Roosevelt refused to do and pointed to The Hague Court as the proper tribunal. The powers finally agreed to this, and thus President Roosevelt scored a great gain for the general cause of international arbitration.

During the summer of 1903 ten mixed commissions sat at Caracas to adjudicate upon the claims of as many nations against Venezuela. These commissions simply determined the amount of the claims. The question as to preferential treatment went to The Hague. In the agreement it was provided that there should be three arbitrators selected by the Emperor of Russia, and that no one of them should be a citizen of any of the signatory or creditor powers. The judges chosen were: M. N. V. Mourawieff, of Russia, Prof. H. Lamash, of Austria, and Prof. F. de Martens, of Russia. The agreement also provided that the proceedings should be in the English language, but that the arguments might be in any other language. The main question for the tribunal to decide was whether or not Germany, Great Britain, and Italy, had acquired by the use of force any rights which other creditor nations did not possess, i. e., whether they

were entitled to preferential treatment. These three powers maintained the affirmative of this proposition, while the others, Holland, Belgium, Norway and Sweden, Denmark, Spain, Mexico, France, and the United States claimed equal rights with the powers which had resorted to force.

The court decided that the three allied powers were entitled to preferential treatment; that Venezuela had recognized in principle the justice of their claims in the protocols she had signed, while she had not recognized in principle the justice of the claims of the pacific powers; that the neutral powers had profited to some extent by the operations of the allies, and that their rights remained for the future absolutely intact. This decision, emanating from a peace court, and endorsing the principle of armed coercion, was received with no small degree of criticism. Attention was called to the fact that the judges were from countries which had always recognized *droit de force* as the principal *modus vivendi*. The choice of judges was necessarily limited where thirteen powers (counting Venezuela) were parties to the suit. The decision was rendered at The Hague February 22, 1904.*

The third case, in which England, Germany and France are parties on the one hand, and Japan on the other, is now in process of submission to The Hague Court.

The peace movement has made rapid progress during the past few months, and President Roosevelt has recently addressed a circular note to the powers with reference to calling a second conference. This call has been the subject of gross misrepresentation, coming as it did on the eve of the Presidential election. The idea, however, did not emanate from the President, but the note was issued in response to a resolution of the Interparliamentary Union at its session in St. Louis in September, 1904. Similar action was taken by the International Congress of Lawyers and Jurists which met at St. Louis the same month, and a week later by the International Peace Congress at Boston.

The Hague Convention does not bind any power to submit any dispute to arbitration. Resort to the Court is purely optional. But during the past year a score or more of treaties have been

*Venezuelan Arbitrations of 1903, Senate Document No. 316, 58th Congress, 2d Session, p. 1057.

concluded between the nations of Europe, binding themselves to submit certain classes of disputes, not affecting their independence, honor, or vital interests, to The Hague Court for arbitration. The most important of these treaties are the Anglo-French, the Anglo-Italian, the Franco-Italian, a treaty between Denmark and Holland, the Franco-Spanish, the Franco-Dutch, the Anglo-Spanish, the Anglo-German, and treaties between England and the Scandinavian powers, and between Spain and Portugal. A number of people think that these treaties are not worth the paper they are written on, but such is not the opinion of publicists. "To settle disputes by arbitration is a very good habit to get into; and once the habit is formed as to minor matters, it is only a step farther to settlement of the major differences by the same means."

Meanwhile the United States has not been idle in this matter of negotiating arbitration treaties. On November 1, 1904, Secretary Hay and the French ambassador signed a treaty along the lines of the Anglo-French agreement. This was followed by treaties of the same tenor with Germany, Switzerland, Portugal, and Great Britain, and it was announced that assurances had been received from Italy, Russia, Mexico, and other powers, that they were ready to negotiate similar treaties.

The arbitration treaties were submitted to the Senate in December last, but were amended in such a way as to render them unacceptable to the President. The first protest against them came from certain Southern Senators, who feared that under their terms the foreign holders of the repudiated bonds of some of the Southern States might bring their claims before the Hague Court. It was therefore proposed to amend the treaties so as to preclude any such possibility. Such an amendment might have been agreed upon, but opposition of a wholly different character soon developed. The interpretation put by the executive upon one clause of the treaties seemed to strike a blow at the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate. The difficulty arose as to the meaning of the word "agreement" in the second article, which reads as follows: "In each individual case the high contracting parties, before appealing to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, shall conclude a special agreement defining clearly the matter in dispute, the scope of the powers of the arbitrators, and the

periods to be fixed for the formation of the arbitral tribunal and the several stages of the procedure." The question was raised as to whether the term "agreement" meant the same as treaty and required the concurrence of the Senate, or whether the President could make such an agreement without the consent of the Senate. When it was found that the President and Secretary Hay took the latter view, an amendment was proposed substituting the word "treaty" for "agreement" in the article quoted above. This amendment not only met the objection raised by the Southern Senators, but further safeguarded the constitutional prerogatives of the Senate, that body holding that the passage of the treaties in the original form would amount to a practical delegation of the treaty-making powers of the Senate to the President. From a constitutional point of view this position was undoubtedly sound.

The President showed no small degree of impatience and even of irritation at this proposed action of the Senate, and in a letter to Senator Cullom, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, dated February 10, stated his views at length. He said: "If the word 'agreement' were retained it would be possible for the Department of State to do as, for instance, it has already done under the Hague treaty in the Pious Fund arbitration case with Mexico, and submit to arbitration such subordinate matters as by treaty the Senate had decided could be left to the executive to submit under a jurisdiction limited by the general treaty of arbitration. If the word 'treaty' be substituted, the result is that every such agreement must be submitted to the Senate; and these general arbitration treaties would then cease to be such, and, indeed, in their amended form they amount to a specific pronouncement against the whole principle of a general arbitration treaty." The President added that if the proposed amendment were adopted he would not refer the treaties back to the other powers for ratification, for in the amended form "they probably represent not a step forward, but a slight step backward as regards the question of international arbitration."

The President's protest was of no avail. On February 11 the Senate ratified the treaties in the amended form, the amendment being adopted by a vote of 50 to 9. The nine votes sustaining the President were cast by the members of the Committee on

Foreign Relations. Even staunch supporters of the President, like Senator Lodge, opposed his views in this matter. It was developed in the discussion that the President had entered into other arrangements with foreign powers under the term of agreements without submitting them to the Senate, and it was felt that the President was too impatient of restraint on his power to manage international questions and that he apparently did not fully appreciate the constitutional limitations imposed upon the executive. It is difficult to see how the President's position in refusing to accept the Senate's amendment can be sustained. The Hague Convention simply established a permanent court of arbitration and adopted certain rules of procedure. It did not make arbitration compulsory in any case. The new treaties went a step further and made arbitration compulsory in certain classes of cases. The fact that under our constitutional system each agreement defining the questions at issue and the extent of the powers of the arbitrators must be submitted to the Senate does not nullify the compulsory features of the treaties, for the Senate as a coördinate branch of the government is just as much bound as the President to carry out in good faith our obligations with foreign powers. All it demands is the right to pass upon such agreements, and to determine whether they come within the scope of the general treaties. The question of the repudiated bonds of certain States is a case in point. A president might decide that they were in the class of questions covered by the general arbitration treaties, while the Senate might take a different view. Wisely or unwisely, our constitution does impose a restraint upon the executive in matters of foreign policy; wisely, most of us think, no doubt. At any rate the Senate has taken a stand clearly within its rights, and it is a matter of regret to all true friends of arbitration that the President should have repudiated the treaties because the Senate undertook to safeguard its constitutional prerogatives by striking out an ambiguous word and substituting one about which there could be no misunderstanding.

Ruskin's Letters to Charles Eliot Norton*

BY HENRY NELSON SNYDER,

President of Wofford College

To have been the trusted friend and helper of a number of great men of letters, to have been their chosen literary executor, to have been faithful after their death in seeing that their genius got itself fairly and adequately before the world, to have been thought by men of such widely differing temperament and gifts as Matthew Arnold, Thomas Carlyle, and John Ruskin to be the leading representative of all that is best in American life, are considerations sufficient to make noteworthy anything Professor Norton gives us. It is good to think, moreover, that this comparatively new American society can grow such as he. Of political and military heroes, of clamorous exponents of the strenuous life, of coarse unrestrained leaders in every phase of our energetic and manifold activities, we have had enough and to spare. The danger is that we shall not have enough of any other sort,—especially of the sort that gives itself to the interpretation of the finer, the saner, the more permanent things in our life and society.

To this all too limited class in our history Professor Norton belongs. Born in Cambridge, Mass., in 1827, graduated from Harvard in 1849, after a short apprenticeship in commercial pursuits, he gave himself to literature, scholarship, social reform, and art. For a time, 1864 to 1868, he was, with Lowell, editor of the *North American Review*. Since 1874 he has been professor of the History of Art at Harvard. Much of his time he has spent in travel, especially in Italy. The fruits of his Italian journeyings and studies have been particularly rich:—"Notes of Travel and Study in Italy" (1860), a translation of Dante's "New Life" (1867), "A History of Church Building in the Middle Ages" (1880), and a prose translation of the "Divine Comedy" (1892). Perhaps no man has done more for that serious and really creditable contribution which America has made to a better understanding and appreciation of the great Florentine.

*Letters of John Ruskin to Charles Eliot Norton, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York, 1905.

All this work of Professor Norton's represents achievement which is reckoned among the best things in American scholarship. To this must be added also his influence in the direction of social comment and interpretation. He has not remained so closely shut up in the cloistered pursuits of mere scholarship as to keep silent when he sees facts and tendencies in our life that need rebuke. He has spoken out so bravely and frankly on our crude excesses, our raw coarseness, our only too frequent failure to recognize and possess the permanent in the temporary, that there have not been wanting those who accuse him not only of being out of sympathy with American progress and ideals but also positively un-American. Of loud-mouthed flatterers and blind shallow optimists, we have had more than our share. Consequently, we have been prone to be impatient with the few who strive to see life steadily and see it whole, and from this wider standpoint, tell us our weaknesses and defects. However, by and by when we shall have attained a better perspective, we shall then be able to rate Professor Norton's social service at its true value.

But with all that he has done, he has perhaps rendered no greater service than that rendered as the friend and chosen executor of men of letters. We are indebted to him for editing the writings of George William Curtis, the letters of James Russell Lowell, the correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson, and now the letters of John Ruskin to himself. His special fitness for this last task comes from a singularly beautiful friendship, lasting from 1855 to Ruskin's death in 1900. To his task Professor Norton has brought taste, tact, and judgment, and knowing Ruskin as he did, he has revealed enough and no more, to let us into the secret of Ruskin's genius and the moods under which his work was done. Taking these letters, therefore, in connection with Ruskin's own singularly frank account of himself in the "*Præterita*," one may doubt whether we shall ever have need of any other "life." Of course Ruskin the Art Critic, Ruskin the Social Reformer, and Ruskin the Man of Letters will have to be re-interpreted in the light of a later and a less biased perspective. But here, in these letters, one must feel that Ruskin the Man is faithfully set before us.

And he himself has said the final word as to Professor Norton's peculiar fitness for this work in the well known account of their

meeting in Switzerland in 1856: "That morning gave me, I said, my first tutor; Dr. John Brown, however far above me in general power, and in the knowledge proper to his own profession, yet in the simplicity of his affection liked everything I wrote, for what was true in it, however imperfectly or faultily expressed; but Norton saw all my weaknesses, measured my narrownesses, and, from the first, took serenely, and as it seemed of necessity, a kind of paternal authority over me, and a right of guidance;—though the younger of the two,—and always admitting my full power in its kind; nor only admitting, but in the prettiest way praising and stimulating." To such a friend as this we may be perfectly sure that Ruskin, always even extravagantly frank, would without reserve open his whole nature, and one can be further sure that out of the mass of his correspondence such a friend would be able to select those things which are characteristic and essential.

It is interesting to note the growth of this friendship as marked by the changes in the mere forms of address which Ruskin uses. The correspondence begins with the acknowledgement of a formal letter of introduction in 1855. "My dear sir" is the conventional way it begins. In the following July they meet again on a small steamer on Lake Geneva. For a few months after that it is "Dear Mr. Norton;" a little later "Dear Norton," and signed "Ever yours affectionately." By 1868 the intimacy had become so deep that we read "My dearest Norton," and after that it is "My dearest Charles." So it continued to the end, with just one interruption, not so much an interruption of friendship as of correspondence, due to Ruskin's utter lack of sympathy with the civil war, in which Norton's heart and soul were so deeply concerned. During the first two years of it Ruskin sent one fierce protest after another, hot with anger and tremulous with horror over the whole business. Finally, October 6, 1863, he writes: "I've no heart to write you while this war is going on." Then follows a ten months' silence broken with these words: "And your American business is so entirely horrible to me that, somehow, it cuts you off from all possibility of my telling you any of my thoughts. It is just as if I saw you washing your hands in blood, and whistling—and sentimentalizing to me." Another year goes by, bringing the war to an end, and Ruskin resumes the correspondence with—"Now you've done fighting, I can talk to you a little again."

His special indignation over the war and failure to understand its deep significance was but one phase of his general dislike of America and American conditions. Even his abiding tenderness for his American friend did not keep him from speaking out with his usual unalloyed frankness. To him Norton's pleasure in ruins generally must have its source in the fact that America is "a very ugly country," and "the very sense of despair about Rome must be helpful and balmy after the over-hopefulness and getting-on-ness of America." Indeed, after seeing some landscapes by "an American painter of some repute," he says that "the ugliness of them is wonderful," and that therefore the "ugliness of the country must be unfathomable." But if to the artist in Ruskin the country itself was intolerable, it seems even worse to Ruskin the social reformer. In a group of American tourists with whom he traveled from Venice to Verona, he thinks he sees a typical product of American conditions. Though traveling in "the most noble part of all the world," they have "no thought or feeling," "except what four poor beasts would have had in their den or menagerie, being dragged about on a hot day." "Add to this misery," he continues, "every form of possible vulgarity, in methods of doing and saying the common things they said and did. I never yet saw humanity so degraded (allowing for external circumstances of every possible advantage). Given wealth, attainable education, and the inheritance of eighteen centuries of Christianity and ten of noble paganism; and this is your result—by means of 'liberty.'" With such as these to represent America, it is no wonder that he could get even some consolation in the midst of European abominations when he considered conditions on this side of the Atlantic: "It really makes me a little more indulgent to the beastliness of modern Europe, to think what we might have got to see and feel by this time, but for the various malaria from America."

This attitude toward America is not the mere by-play of his mind. Even a superficial consideration of his ideas and their development will show that he could hardly have thought otherwise of this new land with its excessive practicality and intense modernness. His impatience, therefore, with America is but a phase of his war with the whole modern world and its ideals. America was simply irretrievably given over to the worship of

the idols which he with his whole soul was seeking to pull down. And in these letters we perhaps see more of the social reformer than we do of the artist or the art critic. It should be remembered that Norton's friendship with him began just at the great turning-point in Ruskin's life, in the beginning of the ferment which resulted in the transformation of the revolutionary art critic into the equally revolutionary critic and reformer of social conditions. He was thirty-six years old, and was engaged at the time with the preparation of volumes three and four of "Modern Painters." As many as seven other volumes on subjects pertaining to art and its principles had brought him largely into the public eye and made him the center of a fierce public controversy. But withal Norton found him a man whose "whole air and manner had a definite and attractive personality," and with "no self-consciousness or sign of consideration of himself as a man of distinction," having "on the contrary, a seeming self-forgetfulness and an almost feminine sensitiveness and readiness of sympathy."

But his previous training and the conditions that conspired to shape his life had not prepared and fortified him for the new directions into which his genius was now to pour itself with such fiery fervor. He had been brought up under the unsleeping, unrelenting authority of his parents, and his religious nature, by temperament so profound, had been wrought upon by the stern, unquestioning puritanism of his mother. What he had really needed, as Norton says, was "a discipline which should develop his power of self-control, and no child was ever more trained to depend upon external authority." As a matter of fact he had in childhood no companions and in maturity no friends with whom he could associate on terms of equality, and thereby learn the common give-and-take of life and gather the practical wisdom of "independent action." He himself confesses in a letter to Rossetti just before his meeting with Norton that he had "no friendships and no loves," and Norton adds, "of all men he most needed friends, and in their place he had admirers and dependents." Nevertheless, though clearly a spoiled child of genius, the victim of over-parental care, and the unfortunate upon whom too early beat the strong glare of publicity, his American friend could say of him: "I have not a memory of those days in which I recall him except as one of the pleasantest, gentlest, and kindest

of men. He seemed cheerful rather than happy. The deepest currents of his life ran out of sight, but it was plain that they did not run calmly, and their troubled course became manifest now and then in extravagances of action and paradoxes of opinion."

These "extravagances" and "paradoxes" and the "troubled" nature of the currents of his life become quite apparent as one reads the letters from this time on. Indeed, it is the sad story of the sorrows of genius that one reads. His whimsical, unrestrained, yet none the less serious and sincere impatience with all so-called modern improvements which men were misnaming progress, with the results of the new industrial and mechanical forces, to him hideous beyond expression, furnish the note of wildly uncompromising protest. His labors at the Workingmen's College at this time (1855-1859) show in a practical way how deeply in earnest he was. He desired with all his soul to make conditions better, and yet hated with hot anger the very conditions he was trying to improve. He was like a knight seeking with unrestrained eagerness the dragon, yet not knowing just what it was nor where. "Some day," he writes, "when I have quite made up my mind what to fight for, or whom to fight, I shall do well enough if I live, but I haven't made up my mind what to fight for; whether Commerce or Business of any kind be an invention of the Devil or not; whether art is a Crime or only an Absurdity; whether Clergymen ought to be multiplied, or exterminated by arsenic, like rats; whether in general we are getting on, and if so, where are we going?"

This was written in 1859, and, in the same year, to the confusion and confusing ferment of his general dissatisfaction with all modern conditions, must be added another element which, by disturbing violently the very foundations of the faith in which he had been brought up, set to seething the deepest currents of his thought and feeling. So, beneath the apparent gayety of the words just quoted, one may read something of the wrench of his Turin experience. On Sunday he went into a little Waldensian chapel, and heard a wretched interpretation, from a narrow evangelical standpoint, of life and its meaning. Thence he went into the art gallery, and stood in the presence of Paul Veronese's Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. Military music was floating in at the windows, "which," he says, "seemed to me more devotional

than anything I remembered of Evangelical hymns." "And," he continues, "as the perfect color and sound gradually asserted their power over me, they seemed finally to fasten me in the old article of Jewish faith, that things done delightfully and rightly were always done by the help and in the spirit of God!" Thus, in his fortieth year his "Evangelical faiths were put aside." This necessitated a complete readjustment of his thinking with reference to both art and religion, for both were inextricably intertwined in Ruskin's nature. "It was a hard, unsettling revelation," Norton adds, "and from the effects of it I believe that he never wholly recovered." From this time on the record of the letters is the story of spiritual, moral and physical tragedy as painful as that of Lear's. His war with the world rages with a wild and extravagant fierceness, made resplendent by the flashing flames of his genius by way of compensation for the lack of self-control and sanity. His sense of all but utter loneliness is not the least of the poignantly pathetic elements in the tragedy of his struggles. "You are almost the only friend I have left," he writes to Norton. "I mean the only friend who understands or feels with me. . . . I don't believe in Evangelicism—and my Evangelical (once) friends now look on me with as much horror as one of the possessed Gennesaret pigs. Nor do I believe in the Pope—and some Roman Catholic friends, who had great hopes of me, think I ought to be burned. Domestically, I am supposed to be worse than Blue Beard; artistically, I am considered a mere packet of squibs and crackers." So this was the mood in which he was closing the middle year of his life, 1860. As Norton says: "His sense of evil in the world was growing daily more intense and bitter, and in view of the selfishness and wastefulness of the rich and the misery of the poor, he was rejecting with scorn the popular and accepted theories of social duties and political economy." Then to the pain of this reconstruction of all his thinking must be added other elements that wrung remorselessly his heart. Rose La Touche, on conscientious scruples concerning his change of faith, refused to marry him, and, due largely to this same change of opinions, was the breaking up of whatever sympathy there had existed between him and his parents. His only resource seemed to be in unrelenting work,—so unrelenting as finally to complete the disasters that were fast crowding upon him by wrecking him nervously and physically.

These, then, were the influences which were working in him when, in 1860, he began in the *Cornhill Magazine* the "Unto this Last" series. One is not surprised that the series brought about his head an even greater storm than that brought by "Modern Painters." His own mood at the time is clearly mirrored in the letters, and enables one the better to understand the mood of all his writings from then on. It is almost one of pathetic hopelessness as to the fight he was waging, yet stirred by fits of flaming anger. "I get into states of disgust and fury at the way the mob is going (meaning by the mob, chiefly dukes, crown princes, and such like persons) that I choke," he writes: "and I have to go to the British Museum to look at Penguins till I get cool." But added to his sense of despair and dissatisfaction with the world, there grows up in him the same feeling with reference to all he himself had done. This finds repeated expression in his usual whimsical, extravagant manner which cannot quite conceal the bitter earnestness beneath. "Intense scorn of all I had hitherto done or thought, still intenser scorn of other people's doings and thinkings, especially in religion," is the way he puts it. Besides his own life at times seems wholly a failure: "I've written a few second-rate books, which nobody minds; I can't draw, I can't play or sing, I can't ride, I walk worse and worse, I can't digest. And I can't help it." In the midst of it all there come out of the depths of his nature passionate cries for peace and rest. He would turn with new interest to the study of natural history in the hope of relief for body, mind, and soul. But even this makes him "giddy and desolate beyond speaking;" still, "it is better than the effort and misery of work for anything human." So there is no hope in anything,—none in himself, in God, in the church, nor even in nature. The foundations seem all but gone from under him. Now and again he returns to Switzerland, the source of so much of his happiness in the past. But while this may give a kind of peace to the tired body, it brings none to the soul. "But where I am in soul I know not, that part of me having disappeared for the present," he piteously writes: "Only don't let me lose you, but stay for me to come and ask for affection again when it will be good to me."

His father died in 1864, and there came upon him the responsibility of managing a large fortune. His new duties and practical

activities in various efforts of reform brought him a kind of peace for the next few years, and something of the old-time playfulness sparkles in the letters. But this mood lasts for only a short time. Over-work brought its penalties, though it was a kind of "opiate." In 1869 he accepted the Slade Lectureship at Oxford, and got no little satisfaction on in the thought that he might now be really accomplishing something by training the students who flocked to his lectures in great numbers. Hence when Norton met him in Siena in 1870, "he was in a delightful mood; the clouds which darkened his spirit had lifted for the moment, and all its sunshine and sweetness had free play."

But the pity of it was that this was only an intermittent flame of joy playing over depths becoming more and more sombre. His mother died in 1871, his "Rosie" a few years later. He kept at his work with furious pace, and a heavier darkness begins to gather. In 1875 he writes: "It is very strange to me to feel all my life to become a thing of the past, and to be now merely like a wrecked sailor, picking up pieces of his ship on the beach." More and more the present seems not for him, and he turns away toward the past,—toward the Middle Ages with a new zeal, preparing the way for another fundamentally disturbing change in his attitude toward life. "The Middle Ages are to me the only ages," he says, and "all modern science and philosophy produces abortion. That miracle-believing faith produced good fruit—the best yet in the world." A kind of spiritualism, strange to say, also comes in to assist in this adjustment of himself to the naive, trusting faith in the Middle Ages. To this his war with the whole modern scheme of things had brought him. He says that it is "no new faith" that he now has, but he is able "to get some good" out of his old one. At any rate, the change seemed to help him, and to induce a more cheerful mood. "Every day," he writes, "brings me more proof of the presence and power of real Gods, with good men; and the religion of Venice is virtually now my own—mine at least (or rather at greatest) including hers, but fully accepting it, as that also of John Bunyan, and of my mother, which I was first taught."

But again the peace was only a pause in the troubled course of his life. Prodigious work, the trials of brain and heart, and the ferment incident to his new spiritual passion brought on a stroke

of insanity in 1878. He, however, denies that overwork was the prime cause. Another attack followed three years after, and again he denies that it came from overwork. "The first time," he writes, "it was a piece of long thought about St. Ursula; and this year it was brought on by my beginning family prayers again with my servants on New Year's Day—and writing two little collects every morning—one on a bit of Gospel, the other on a bit of Psalm." Still with all the bitterness of his experiences, four years later we hear him saying: "The last two years have shown me more spirituality in the world than all my former life." Another illness came in 1889, and the rest, till the end in 1900, was retirement and comparative peace for this sorely tried, storm-tossed soul.

In this review we have tried to follow the shifting of Ruskin's spiritual and intellectual moods that one may realize under what stress of soul his work was done, and thereby better understand it, not only for what of absolute truth it may contain but also as the revelation of a greatly tried genius. From this standpoint, Professor Norton has given, in these letters, an intimate biography of Ruskin. Here we have the record of the soul of him, and this is the chief thing after all, whatever may be the vagaries and extravagances of his thought on social and artistic subjects.

The Overproduction of Cotton and a Possible Remedy

BY ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS,*

Instructor in American History in the University of Wisconsin

There can be little question that the tendency to overproduce cotton has been chronic since shortly after its production on a large scale was made possible by the invention of Whitney's gin. The tremendous extent of the territory in the Southern States available for cotton raising, the possibility of splendid profits, always in view but oftener as mirage than as reality, and the force of very strong custom among the people, white and black, have been, and continue to be, responsible for this frequent over-supplying of the market. The record-breaking proportions of the crop of 1904, now being marketed, put powerful emphasis upon this phenomenon, which a year ago was almost entirely obscured in the public mind by the fortuitous shortage of the few preceding crops. A year ago the cotton consuming world was anxious over the possibility of a decreasing supply; and many people in the American cotton belt professed a solicitude for the preservation of the South's monopoly of the cotton output, then in a fancied danger through foreign competition under the stimulation of the prevailing high prices. Thus the pendulum of public opinion swings from time to time, not always moderately but often to extremes; and thus it has swung through the whole of a century.

On the one hand, the South is said to have a practical monopoly of its great staple; on the other, it is clear that for no long period have the people of the cotton belt enjoyed as much prosperity and comfort through that monopoly as certain other peoples have had who possessed no such striking natural advantage. The case is fairly comparable to that in the Texan oil fields recently exploited. Through either mistaken or unfortunate management the great majority of the participators in the industry have failed to secure an adequate return upon their capital and labor employed.

*Dr. Phillips is a native of Georgia and a graduate of the University of Georgia.

The history of prosperity and adversity in cotton production has been somewhat similar to that in tobacco and rice production and in certain mining industries; but the scale has been larger, the dependence of the people greater, and the vicissitudes more striking. A sketch of the early period will give illustration.

Between 1793 and 1805 a number of fortunes, splendid for those times, were made by cotton planters; and the prospects were bright for the increase of prosperity. But from the time of the embargo to the end of the second war with Great Britain, in 1815, the foreign market was largely cut off and the prices fell so low that some of the planters feared the complete ruin of cotton as a staple.

Upon the return of peace and the reopening of commerce the prices of cotton ranged so high for several years in succession that a veritable mania for cotton raising spread over the land, and people by tens of thousands, rich and poor, flocked into the Southwestern country, into all the fertile districts from Georgia and Kentucky to Western Louisiana, and later into Texas, in the hope of securing quick prosperity through the production of the fleecy staple. A graphic picture of the situation in 1826-7 was drawn by a traveler who made a journey from Charleston through Augusta and Montgomery to New Orleans and thence to Huntsville and Nashville. His letter describing the trip was published anonymously in one of the Georgia newspapers of the time.*

In part it reads as follows:

"When I took my last walk along the wharves in Charleston, and saw them piled up with mountains of Cotton, and all your stores, ships, steam and canal boats, crammed with and groaning under the weight of cotton, I returned to the Planters' Hotel, where I found the four daily papers, as well as the conversation of the boarders, teeming with Cotton! Cotton!! Cotton!!! Thinks I to myself, 'I'll soon change this scene of cotton.' But, alas! how easily deceived is short-sighted man! Well, I got into my gig and wormed my way up through Queen, Meeting, King, and St. Phillip's streets, dodging from side to side, to steer clear of the cotton waggons, I came to the New Bridge Ferry. Here I crossed over in the horse-boat, with several empty cotton waggons, and found a number on the other side, loaded with cotton, going to town. From this I continued on, meeting with little else than cotton fields, cotton gins, cotton waggons—but 'the wide, the unbounded prospect lay before me!' I arrived in Augusta, and when I saw cotton waggons in

*Georgia Courier [Augusta, Ga.], October 11, 1827.

Broad street I whistled! but said nothing!!! But this was not all; there was more than a dozen tow-boats in the river, with more than a thousand bales of the cotton on each, and several steamboats with still more. And you must know that they have cotton warehouses there covering whole squares, all full of cotton; and some of the knowing ones told me, that there were then in the place from 40,000 to 50,000 bales. And Hamburg (as a negro said) was worse, according to its size; for it puzzled me to tell which was the largest, the piles of cotton or the houses. I now left Augusta and overtook hordes of cotton planters from North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, with large gangs of negroes, bound to Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana; 'where the cotton land is not worn out.'

" . . . I continued my journey passing cotton fields; till I arrived at Holt's Ferry, on the Oconee, where I saw three large pole boats loaded with bales of cotton, twelve tiers in height. From thence I went to Milledgeville, where I found the prevailing topic of the place, 'What an infernal shame it was, that such a quantity of virgin cotton land should be suffered to remain in the possession of the infernal Creek Indians.' I moved on to the westward, crossing Flint River, and from thence to the Chattahoochee found cotton land speculators thicker than locusts in Egypt. But from Line Creek to Montgomery (14 miles) the land is nearly level; the fields of one plantation joining by a fence those of another; and all extending back from the road farther than you can distinctly see; and the cotton pretty even, and about as high as the fences, and has the appearance (as Riley says of Zahara) of a complete horizon of cotton. They have, almost all of them, overplanted; and had not more than one-half their cotton picked in; each plantation has a cotton gin. I next came to Montgomery, which I found overstocked with cotton, and no boats to take it away. From Montgomery I went to Blakely, and on my way, saw many cotton plantations, and met, and overtook, nearly one hundred cotton waggons, traveling over a road so bad, that a State prisoner could hardly walk through it to make his escape. And although people say that Blakely is done over, there was not a little cotton in it. From there I crossed over to Mobile, in a small steamboat loaded up to the top of the smoke-pipe with cotton. This place is a receptacle monstrous for the article: look which way you will you see it; and see it moving; keel-boats, steamboats, ships, brigs, schooners, wharves, stores, and press-houses, all appeared to be full."

And so the story runs on with descriptions of similar conditions prevailing in all of the western cotton belt.

This tremendous activity led at times to the spoiling of the market. In 1839, for example, there was a great fall in cotton prices, and a fearful panic throughout the belt, which entailed severe depression for half the following decade. Then the world's demand gradually gained once more upon the supply, and the

price rose by 1850 to ten or eleven cents where it remained fairly steady for ten years of prosperity.* The hard times of the forties were forgotten, and cotton was again enthroned as king without any rival pretending to share the devotion of his subjects. This mighty king was expected to render overwhelming aid in the war of the sixties and secure victory for the South in its battle against the world. The outcome is notorious.

After the war cotton was for a decade or two of necessity again the chief reliance in Southern industry. And again the old habit of complete dependence upon the staple tended to grow in strength. The low prices in the nineties checked that tendency for the time, and promoted some diversification of industry; but the high prices of 1902-4 have revived the mania, and now the fact is emphasized that, as of old, the South is securing relatively little advantage from its natural and unique source of wealth. While cotton prices are low and tend to remain very near the cost of production, the cotton producers continue to be obliged to pay abnormally high rates for most of their supplies, and through the protective tariff and the pension policy of the United States government, the South must continue to pay its enormous annual tribute to the sections which control the federal government. There is clearly a grave problem to be faced; and suggestions for its solution ought to receive consideration, even when they contemplate a radical departure from current practice.

II.

The American cotton belt has a combination of advantages for cotton production which is unequalled in any other part of the world; and the American output in its relation to the world's demand is by far the greatest factor in fixing prices in the world's market. That is to say, the South has, within limits, a potential monopoly of the product. Among its advantages are: 1. A very broad expanse of territory, and the best climate in the world for cotton production—a warm and extended growing season with a specially long and fine autumn for the harvest. And it has plenty of rainfall for cotton culture, which renders costly irrigation unnecessary. 2. It has cheap labor in large

*Ten cents in that period was in general purchasing power equivalent to about fourteen or fifteen cents at the present day.

amount. This is needed in economical cotton production, because the gathering of the crop is too tedious to justify the employment of high-priced labor. 3. It has an efficient managing class. These expert plantation managers are essential in maintaining a system of organized industry and for the utilization of the cheap labor, which would otherwise be costly on account of the ignorance and unreliability of the negroes. This combination is unparalleled in the world; and in spite of the efforts of European governments for the past half century to promote cotton culture in Asia and Africa, it appears highly probable that North America will continue for a long time to control the cotton supply. There are many districts in the world which could make large amounts of cotton at a cost of, say, fifty cents a pound; but very few indeed can produce more than they now produce at less than twenty cents. And below that price the only severe competition which an American cotton producer need fear is that of the other American cotton planters.

The American cotton growers alone can spoil their market; but *they* can do it with the greatest ease; they have done it in many seasons gone by, and bid fair to continue indefinitely in the same practice. Let us see why this is so.

A very important feature in the situation is the fact that the world's demand for cotton is much less elastic than the supply. People want about as many clothes and ships as many sails one year as another: the demand for cotton, while constantly tending to increase, is relatively steady. But the supply fluctuates through a wide range. Not only does the acreage vary from year to year at the discretion of the planters, but the weather conditions, to which the crop is extremely sensitive, differ enormously, and not at all at the planters' will. The fact that three-fourths of the world's total market supply is grown in one geographic province intensifies the importance of the weather and increase the variability of the output. The demand being fairly steady and the supply quite variable, the market is nearly always either under supplied or over supplied. A normal relation is very hard to maintain, and a normal price is a thing in the realm of pure conjecture. The price has ranged all the way from four cents to a dollar a pound and back again in the last seventy years; and it has played between six and a half and seventeen cents within the last twelve months.

These considerations bring out the fact that cotton production is in very large degree a speculative enterprise: it has many of the features of a lottery. And by its influence through a long period of time it has fostered a headlong plunging disposition among the people. By offering alluring promise of high profits if the local crops be good and the general prices high, it obscures the more probable prospect of very moderate gains or positive losses. In this way there is exerted a constant tendency toward the production of too great a supply of cotton, which ruins the market and diminishes or destroys the legitimate profits of the planter. This keeps the planters poor and keeps the whole community poverty-stricken along with them. And, what is quite as bad, it makes the income of the community extremely uneven and uncertain from year to year. Fickleness of income, whether with individuals or great bodies of men, is a most demoralizing factor, promoting a disposition to squander the resources in hand and let the morrow take care of itself. When men cannot reckon what next year will probably bring, they naturally cease to plan that far ahead, and the happy-go-lucky disposition must prevail. A certain degree of stability is essential for the promotion of thrift, sobriety and foresight. Fickleness in the returns from one industry must be pernicious wherever it is not offset by the development of other resources on a scale correspondingly large. It thus appears that if the world should make efficient demand for all the cotton the South could produce, it would not be wholesome for the cotton belt to devote its whole energy to raw cotton.

But the world does not demand as much raw cotton as the American producers can supply. The world's demand is too small to justify the employment of all the cotton belt land and labor in the one industry. In last analysis the cotton problem is a labor problem, and the special need for Southern prosperity is the need of keeping the surplus labor out of the cotton fields. To secure a long succession of fat years this surplus labor must be invited out, if the invitation be effective; driven out, if compulsion be necessary. The pressing need is that of other attractions with satisfactory remuneration for labor. We should not hold fast blindly to ancient custom, but seek throughout the world for advantageous ideas and apply them to Southern needs.

When used as a special advantage, cotton is a splendid resource, but as a sole reliance it brings the people more injury than good. The fundamental problem is to raise other enterprises, great and small, to an equal or higher level than that of cotton production in their attractiveness to labor, and thus secure the double benefit of adding new resources and at the same time checking the cotton output and increasing the remuneration therefrom.

It is hardly necessary to enlarge upon the advantages to accrue from the diversification of industry, and especially the development of manufactures. The excellent conditions which now prevail in and around the manufacturing centers which have already arisen, and the effect of that movement in raising cotton prices in the past few years are sufficiently convincing object lessons.

But this movement should not be checked, as it now threatens to be, by the fresh competition of the cotton fields in the demand for labor.* The benefits are cumulative, i. e., the larger and more numerous the manufacturing towns, the greater the demand for truck and dairy supplies and the fruits of varied industries; the better the opportunity for educational improvement, and the better the opening for progressive spirit. And, by the way, an increase in general comfort and enlightenment must needs bring a lessening of race friction and crime, for when there's plenty of good things to go around, people are not prone to quarrel.

Is this utopian condition possible of achievement and how? It is suggested in various quarters (by men whose memories are short) that the banks in the cotton belt be organized into a cotton-holding trust and thus drive prices up. But that very project was tried in 1837-9 with the most disastrous results. A somewhat more hopeful method is urged by the Cotton Growers' Association, recently organized, which is holding meetings in many counties, at which the growers resolve to keep their remaining bales off the market and reduce their acreage for the coming year. This may now achieve more success than a similar effort in the nineties, but its effect can be no more than temporary. Men cannot be deterred from following the most inviting and accustomed paths by mere persuasion, unless new openings be made which promise to be equally or more inviting. Industrial

*Numerous mills in the South are now reporting a portion of their looms and spindles idle from a dearth of operatives.

experiments and education ought to and doubtless will in the long run promote the diversification of industry and the improvement of the general welfare, but without some special stimulus that work promises to be slow in the South.

These are the well-worn remedies, discussed with vigor from time to time for many years past, and thus far with little but spasmodic result. If the current of progress in the Saxon race in general be likened to the flow of a mighty river, that of the plantation States of America may perhaps be compared to the surge and recession of the waves on the seashore—advance from time to time, but little genuine progress. If at first sight this appears unfair, let a comparison be made of the status of things at the present time with that in the days of William Byrd and Alexander Spotswood, or of George Washington, James Wright, and the Lowndes and the Pinckneys, or of Wade Hampton, George Troup, Thomas Dabney and their contemporaries of the ante-bellum cotton régime. This relative lack of progress in the South may perhaps be explained without discredit to the South. But explanation and justification are not satisfying when progress is demanded, when a remedy for depression is the need of the times, and a preventive of hard times the need of the future.

In economic concerns no man may remold conditions at will, nor prophesy developments with much accuracy or confidence, but in view of the general needs of the Southern situation and the inefficacy of time-honored methods, a new suggestion which may serve as a thesis to attract criticism and arouse thought may be well in place. Let us therefore consider the advisability of a tax on cotton production and a bounty on cotton manufactures and other industries of promise in the cotton growing States.

III.

To oversupply the market is easily accomplished by the American cotton producers. In fact it is only through voluntary restraint that oversupply is to be avoided. Land is superabundant, the weather can be counted on when a succession of years is under consideration, and there is more labor at hand than the world demands at a remunerative price in the cotton fields. But if cotton is superficially too attractive to labor, some recourse ought to be found by which to offset this superficial attraction

by more substantial ones in other directions. The great problem is that of deterring the surplus labor from joining the rush and bringing general distress.

If no more than enough labor is devoted to cotton, the producers and the country get the benefit of monopoly prices. But if too much labor be employed, the monopoly is ruined and hardly anybody is benefited but the consumers, and they in an infinitesimal degree.

With firm resolution and concerted action it would appear possible for the State governments of the cotton belt to *protect* the cotton-raising industry from cut-throat competition by taxing its product, and to promote other industries at the same time by devoting to their aid the proceeds of the cotton tax. It is one of the very obvious, though paradoxical, truths of finance that a tax on mortgages does not fall on the holders of the mortgages, but through a raising of the rate of interest it is shifted upon the borrowers. Likewise a tax on a monopolized commodity would in the average case, by decreasing the output, raise the price so that the producer would in the long run be relieved of all the burden of the tax and even probably receive an actual surplus income considerably greater than the amount of that tax.

Imagine for a moment, as a somewhat radical application of the policy, that all the governments of the cotton States had recently imposed a tax of one cent per pound on all cotton hereafter raised and ginned in those States, and at the same time offered a large part of the proceeds of that tax as a bounty upon certain other selected industries, and let it be understood by the people that the purpose of the measure was the reduction of the acreage, as a patriotic enterprise, and the promotion of the general welfare. It is not unreasonable to suppose that such enactment would cause the withdrawal of, say, twenty per cent. of the labor from the cotton fields which would otherwise be employed therein. The twenty per cent. decrease in the labor would probably cause a reduction of about twenty per cent. in the output. Reckoning from the course of past fluctuations a decrease of twenty per cent. in the output would cause an increase in prices of much more than twenty per cent.; perhaps as much as forty or sixty per cent. This would of course mean a handsome increase in the net profits of the cotton producers. And by

means of the tax and bounty system this benefit would at once be distributed throughout the whole community. Meanwhile the laborers withdrawn from cotton production because of this measure would be profitably employed in other industries; and the product of their labor would be in large part an additional clear gain to the commonwealth. Let this be kept up for a number of years, and the cotton belt might well experience a gradual revolution in industry by which cotton growing would become merely one of several great industrial resources and would rank as a unique and splendid advantage bringing great wealth, instead of a sole reliance, and a poor one, for keeping the wolf from the door.

For beneficial results, indeed, it would probably not be necessary to unite all the cotton States in this policy. If only a few of the greater ones acted in accord (upon the advice, we will say, of a joint commission) the benefits would still be great. A reduction of twenty per cent. in acreage in three or four of the large cotton States would decrease the total American output by half that percentage, and would raise the price materially. At the same time the use of the proceeds of the tax, in promoting manufactures, etc., in those States would substantially increase the resources and wealth of their people. And even if a single great cotton State tried the plan without the coöperation of its sisters, the hope of benefit from the diversification of industry and the increase of resources would not be unreasonable.

The simplest method of administration would be to levy the tax at the ginneries, and offer a drawback of the full amount of the tax as bounty to any factory in the State upon its presenting evidence of having worked up into cloth the bales upon which the tax had been paid. It might be a wholesome modification to give the full drawback only to new mills, say for the first ten years of their operation, and reduce the bounty given the old mills to one-half the rate of the tax collected. If it be feared that a tax of one cent a pound would cause too great a disturbance of industry, a lower rate of tax might well be adopted instead. After the payment of the bounty on cotton manufactures, the surplus proceeds of the tax might be advantageously devoted to bounties upon the manufacture of furniture, the raising of hay and cattle, and upon other industries which give promise of

successful development under such a stimulus. And a large part of it could be devoted with excellent results to the improvement of education and other great public purposes.

But whether this specific remedy of tax and bounties be applied is a minor consideration. The essential need is by some means or other to diversify industry at the South and counteract the tendency to spoil the cotton market by overproduction. And the present epoch, while the people are freed from debt through the virtue of short cotton crops, and are their own masters,—the present is the time for study and action leading to the end in view. We have had enough depression this year to emphasize the need of preparing in fat years for the lean ones which are liable to follow; and the lesson should be eagerly acted upon.

Let us keep on building factories, and take away all the profit we can from the outside districts, which are parasites upon the South, and let us plant more orchards and vineyards and broad fields of varied crops; let us raise the best sorts of grasses and forage crops, and cover the land with lowing herds and thrifty creameries. In a word, let us follow the example of England, with her wool; France, with her wine, and New England, with her fisheries, and make use of our staple product as a special advantage through which to secure wealth for a complete and rounded and self-reliant industrial system. Such must be our objective; the ways and means of reaching it must be an ever-present problem.

Matthew Whitaker Ransom: A Senator of the Old Regime

By ROBERT LEE FLOWERS,

Professor of Mathematics in Trinity College

When Matthew Whitaker Ransom died at his home in Northampton county, North Carolina, a few months ago, there passed away a man who for nearly half a century occupied a commanding place in his State and for many years an important place in our national life. He belonged to that class of Southern statesmen which has almost disappeared. He was the product of a civilization, which, despite all its limitations, has yet a peculiar charm for those of the present generation. The old order has changed, but we still feel the fascination of ante-bellum Southern life, and admire the men whom it produced. General Ransom was one who received from the old order the best that it could give, but who adapted himself to the changed conditions after the civil war, and achieved success under the new order of things.

He was born in Warren county, North Carolina, October 8, 1826. He was the son of Robert and Priscilla (Whitaker) Ransom, a grandson of Seymour and Burchett (Green) Ransom, and of Matthew Carey and Betsy Anne (Coffield) Whitaker, and a grand nephew of Nathaniel Macon. With a long line of distinguished ancestry back of him, he was by inheritance, a type of the best product of our Southern life. He was graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1847. During his college course he gave evidence of more than usual power, and when President Polk attended the commencement exercises at Chapel Hill, Ransom was chosen to deliver the "Salutatory." The correspondent of the *New York Herald*, who accompanied the Presidential party, in writing to his paper said, "Of the compositions by the young disciples of Cicero, the Salutatory by Mr. Ransom was unquestionably the best. He had the advantage of the most fertile field, however, and the most popular theme. His welcome to the President of the United States was superior to anything of the kind throughout the whole expedition—his welcome to the people at large was also in fine taste; while the beauty and the

finished elegance of the welcome to the ladies drew down upon his devoted head repeated rounds of applause."

The same year that he was graduated, Ransom was admitted to the bar, and began at once the practice of his profession in his native county, at the same time taking an active interest in politics. His father was an ardent Whig, and it was natural that he should be of the same political faith. For one who had an ambition to succeed in political life, the prospects were not inviting, for the county was Democratic by an overwhelming majority. Young Ransom very soon took a high stand as a lawyer, and the success which he achieved brought him into prominence in the State. In 1852 he was placed on the Whig ticket as presidential elector. By a strange turn of political affairs, the legislature, which was Democratic, elected Ransom, a Whig, to the position of Attorney General over Hon. William Eaton, who was a Democrat and a lawyer of prominence and ability. After retaining the position for three years, Ransom resigned. In 1853, he married Miss Exum, of Northampton county, to which county he soon after changed his residence. It was during his incumbency of the office of Attorney General of the State, that new political conditions arose and Ransom found himself no longer in sympathy with his party. He became a supporter of the Democratic party, and in 1858 and again in 1860 he represented his adopted county in the General Assembly. He had large landed interests, and he became a planter on an extensive scale.

Just as Ransom was coming to take an active and influential place in public life there were beginning to be heard in the distance the mutterings of the storm which was to cover this section of the country with darkness and despair. The dangers which threatened the Union were evident on all sides. Ransom was a Southerner by inheritance and by all the ties which he held most dear, yet to his mind the greatest calamity that could befall the people and the land he loved, would be the dismemberment of the Union. Secession, he believed, was not the best way to remedy the peculiarly unfortunate situation which slavery had brought about in the nation. In 1856 he delivered an address before the literary societies of the University of North Carolina, in which he made an earnest plea for the preservation of the Union. In the course of his address he said: "This is the question which this

generation has to settle, not only for itself, but for generations in all time to come—the most momentous question that ever engaged the souls of patriots—the preservation of the Union of the States and people of America. I shall not stop to inquire, neither my inclination nor the proprieties of the occasion permit me to inquire, whether the constitution established a Federal or a National Union—whether sovereignty resides with the peoples of the States as bodies, or in the people of the United States as a whole. These questions belong to other places and times—they now threaten the Union with no danger, and are almost forgotten in the happy fact that whatever its peculiar character may be, the Union has well answered the purposes and hopes of those who formed it. But there is a danger—a dark and gloomy danger—an appalling and overwhelming danger—which hovers in black clouds over our government and liberties, and casts a livid and frightful shade over this beautiful land. It is Dismemberment which agitates the bosom of the Republic.

. We hear it discussed in social circles, proclaimed by the press and advocated in public councils. Let us not be deceived by sounds. Dismemberment means nothing less than the disruption of the government. Disunion contemplates anarchy, war, civil war, havoc and might. It can contemplate nothing else. And after it is all over, if it ever shall be over, where will we find ourselves? How shall we stand in our own eyes and the eyes of the world? As you appreciate the blessings of good government, the priceless inheritance of civil and religious liberty, the universal esteem of mankind, and the fate of our race for all future ages, as you reverence the memory of our Fathers, and love the honor of our country, as philanthropists, patriots, and Christians—I implore you, by all of these considerations, to use your influence to preserve and immortalize the Union of these States and the Constitution under which we live, and God grant that that Constitution and that Union, enrobed in the mantle of Washington, may last forever."

Ransom was an ardent Unionist, and he made every effort to prevent secession. By February 1st, 1861, seven States had declared themselves out of the Union and had recalled their representatives from Washington. Early in February, 1861, a bill was passed by the legislature of North Carolina for the election

of delegates to a convention, with a provision that each voter should also at the same time cast a ballot for or against holding the said convention. By a small majority this measure to call the convention was defeated. In the meantime the war between the States had virtually begun, and President Lincoln had called on North Carolina for troops. The legislature of the State called a convention, and on May 20th the State passed the ordinance of secession. Ransom, ex-Governor Swain, and John L. Bridgers, Esq., were sent as peace commissioners to Montgomery, Ala., where the confederate congress was in session. It was still hoped that something could be done to avoid civil war. All efforts for peace having failed, an ordinance of secession already a reality, civil war already begun, Ransom enlisted as a private soldier, but before beginning active service he was appointed a lieutenant-colonel of the First North Carolina Infantry. The records of the war show that he was a brave and courageous soldier. He was wounded at Malvern Hill, and desperately wounded at Drewry's Bluff. He was promoted to the position of colonel of the Thirty-fifth Infantry, and later made a brigadier-general. In 1865 he was made major-general—though his commission was never delivered—and General John B. Gordon has recorded that it was "for most distinguished gallantry."

General Ransom surrendered at Appomattox Court House and returned to his home in Northampton county to begin life again under a new order of things. He set himself to the task of restoring peace and of building up again the devastated country. How faithfully he did this is shown in the following extract from a letter written by Major T. L. Emry, of Weldon, N. C.:

"When the war was over I saw him almost daily. The fortunes of war had broken him in pocket, but not in spirit. I well remember his telling me that the first money he had in 1865 was obtained by sending a wagon-load of turkeys, ducks, geese, and pork to Petersburg, Va., a distance of sixty miles, and how glad he felt when the gentleman whom he had sent with the wagon came back and handed him the money for the sale of the same. He had prior to the war purchased much land in Northampton county. Of course the war left this almost valueless to him; but not for one moment did he despair. He made the best arrangements possible with his former slaves and went to work with

almost renewed vigor. His law practice which he had before the war soon came to him again, and in a few years, despite the short crops, mean labor, and low prices, General Ransom was again 'the man' of this section. Everyone looked to him for aid and counsel. Though in financial straits himself, all who knew him said: 'General Ransom will help me out,' and many a one did he aid. Never through all this trying period, from 1865 to 1873, did I know him to be anything but the same courteous gentleman—brave, energetic, of almost superhuman energy, ever ready to help a friend, especially an old soldier—trying in every way, by word and action, to reunite the country and heal the wounds of the war."

During the next few years Ransom delivered many addresses, and he contributed much towards bringing about a better condition of things. In May, 1870, he was invited by the women of North Carolina to deliver a memorial address over the confederate dead in the capital of the State. He delivered this address, as he himself said, "when the ink was not dry upon the paper which proclaimed to the Southern people that their friends had not been allowed to honor the graves of the confederate soldiers at Arlington." In the course of his speech he said, "I thank God there are flowers enough in this beautiful land of the South to strew upon the graves of those who fell alike in the gray and the blue, and there are hearts pure enough and hands gentle and generous enough to perform this holy duty."

His conciliatory attitude is also clearly shown by the following extract from a newspaper report of an address delivered in Salisbury in 1873: "The speaker foresaw the early return of a day of thorough reconciliation between the sections lately engaged in deadly conflict and still estranged by the yet lingering passion kindled by war and kept alive by the arts of the demagogue. He could see the returning sense of justice, the growth of a more fraternal feeling, and a consciousness of mutual dependence and coöperation for the grand purpose of building up and maintaining the mighty nation it seemed the purpose of Providence to have founded. It was a speech for the nation to hear, for it was so full of wise counsel and hopeful suggestion that its influence would be most happily felt in allaying sectional animosities and kindling afresh the fire of a common patriotism."

Probably one of the greatest services he rendered his State was in securing a writ of *habeas corpus* from Judge Brooks in 1870, which brought about the release of a large number of citizens who had been seized and imprisoned by Kirk, who was acting under orders from Governor Holden. A test case had been prepared and application was made to Chief Justice Pearson for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The writ was granted and served on Kirk, but he had refused to appear in court. Pearson declined to take any further steps, and feeling was running so high that it was feared bloodshed would be the result. As the only means of relieving the situation, General Ransom applied to Judge Brooks, a federal judge, and convinced him of his power to intervene. Kirk was brought into court by order of the federal judge, and the prisoners were released. This action relieved a condition of affairs which was becoming very critical.

In 1870 Governor Zebulon B. Vance was elected to the United States Senate, but his disabilities had not been removed and he was refused admittance. The legislature of 1872 elected Ransom to the senate to fill the vacancy thus created. It was a time that called for men of calm judgment and true manhood. There were men in the senate who were hot-headed and vindictive, and it was fortunate that a man of Ransom's temperament and ability should represent the State at this critical time. The purposes and aims which dominated him, the generous and patriotic spirit which he manifested are clearly shown by the first speech which he delivered in the senate in 1875. The senate had under consideration a resolution for the admission of P. B. S. Pinchback as senator from Louisiana. Many bitter and vindictive speeches had been made, calculated, not to allay, but to stir up sectional feeling. With a hope of doing something to cool the fires of passion Senator Ransom delivered an extended speech on "The South Faithful to Her Duties," which was so free from passion, so magnanimous in spirit, so noble in purpose, so eloquent in expression, that it attracted wide attention. In the course of his speech he said: "For nearly three years I have sat silently in this chamber with the hope that by pursuing a course, as I thought, of impartial and patriotic duty I might have some influence in satisfying Northern senators that the South desired peace with the North and a restored and fraternal union of all the States of

the Republic. I came from the true State of North Carolina to the senate of the United States with a sacred purpose to reconcile the once divided people of my country, to harmonize all sectional differences and disputes, to bury in oblivion every bitter recollection of war, and to convince the people of the North that our people of the South sincerely desired to live with them in concord under the common protection of a constitutional and united government. Before this greatest and best desire of my life, the desire of having a part in restoring the union of the States firmly in the hearts of all our people, all other passions sank into insignificance. This was the object of my political existence. To accomplish it no sacrifice seemed too dear, except the dishonor of my State and the South. I knew this inestimable blessing to my country could only be consummated by our doing full justice to the North, and by the North doing full justice to us, and I had faith that both sections would be equal to that great duty. . . . I had, too, and still have, this thought, one that to many of you may appear strange and unnatural, but still sincere and true and ardently cultivated in my bosom, that as I had fought for the South, and its cause had failed and the Union had been established, it became me as a true man to render to the government of my country, now embraced by me, the same devotion—for I could have no greater—that I had exhibited to the South. . . . I shall send no firebrands to the South to incense and inflame her proud people. I shall send no poisoned arrows to the North to rankle in the bosom of her peace. I shall endeavor to hold up the light of truth to both sections, that each may see in the other much to commend and something to forgive and forget. And should unjust assault be made upon any State of this union, be it North or South, I shall spring to her defence with whatever of courage or ability I may have."

Senator Ransom was re-elected to the senate in 1877, again in 1883, and again in 1889. He represented his State in the senate for twenty-four years. At the close of this period, by a coalition of the Populist and Republican parties the legislature was lost to the heretofore dominant party and a senator of different political faith succeeded him. The length of time Ransom served as senator shows how acceptable he was to the people of the State. He seldom delivered a set speech in the senate, but by his

faithful attention to duty, by his tact and uniform courtesy, he became exceedingly popular in Washington, and useful to the people of his State. During President Cleveland's administration he exerted great influence with the dominant party. He was a strong supporter of Cleveland in almost all the policies which he advocated.

During a long career in the senate, he was a power in politics in his own State. In campaign years he spoke in all sections of the State, and his canvass always resulted in arousing great enthusiasm. He was a man blessed with a magnificent figure—tall, erect, and commanding in appearance. His language was always chaste. He resorted to no abuse of his opponents. He was one of the few political speakers whose crowd at the close of his speech was always larger than at the beginning. His personal popularity was very great, and he had wonderful power of winning and holding the allegiance of men. He was so affable and gracious to all classes of people that it was sometimes intimated that he was actuated by policy. How strongly this was denied by those who knew him best is clearly shown in the following extract from a letter from a man who was for many years a close personal friend:

"It has been suggested that my warm-hearted, genial friend was a man of policy. Doubtless that suggestion emanated from a total stranger, for surely not one of the hosts who ever saw him advancing with the glad smile and open arms of welcome, or in the railroad coach, where he invariably greeted everyone, white or black, before taking his seat, could feel that there lay any policy behind it all. I recall one incident of the many during our long friendship, that should dispel the slightest shadow of such a suggestion. One afternoon I was passing General Ransom's headquarters, when he commanded a brigade in the Army of Northern Virginia. He was standing in front of his tent door, and on recognizing me he ran to me, threw his arms around my neck, and almost forced me to stop for a chat. Could policy have prompted such an act towards a soiled, ragged private, who could assist him in no way? No, it was but the generous outpouring of a soul that all recognized, and I pity the few who could not understand it."

Ransom's idea of dealing with political opposition is shown in

a letter which he wrote to his brother, General Robert Ransom, in 1880. He had been informed by his brother of some opposition to his re-election which was developing in the eastern part of the State. In a letter in reply to the one giving him the information he said, in part:

"North Carolina has been so good to me that I studiously deprecate difference or crimination with any of her citizens. Magnanimity, high conduct, a grand dignity, superior to trifles and to small or bad men, are invincible with North Carolinians. Every time an opponent, or any of his faction, proposes to strike at me, I intend to answer the complaint by some new service to our State, by greater and more manifest generosity to my adversaries, and by showing an utter indifference to the flies that may light about my horns. Of course, if my honor should be assailed I should attend to it very differently. Enemies are a terror. It is a thousand times easier to conciliate than to crush. Caesar very often filled his legions with his enemies. Excuse all this. I am generally right in my views."

As soon as his term of service in the senate was completed, President Cleveland appointed him minister to Mexico. His dignified bearing, his courteous manners, and his generous spirit made him exceedingly popular with the people of Mexico. He was very successful in bringing to a satisfactory settlement several perplexing questions which arose during his term of service. On his retirement from diplomatic service, after two years' stay in Mexico, his work in cementing the friendly relations between the two countries received the highest commendation. President Cleveland, in a letter to the writer, says: "I was very glad to appoint him (Ransom), on his retirement from the senate, as minister to Mexico, where he performed his duty to my entire satisfaction; and I was pleased to hear, after his return, that he had prospered in business. I do not wonder at the high place he held in the affections of the people of his State."

After his return from Mexico he devoted his time and energies to his large landed interests. He delivered occasional addresses in the State, but took no very active part in political affairs. He owned several thousand acres of land, and he became a planter on an extensive scale. His relations with the negroes, of whom he employed a large number, were always friendly. The negro

race looked on him as their friend. His liberal views were expressed in a speech delivered in the senate in 1875, in the course of which he said: "I would impair no right of the colored man. I would protect him faithfully in every right secured to him by the constitution, and especially by the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments. I would protect him in his liberty, his citizenship, his right to vote. I would go further and educate him and elevate him to the high position of all the duties and capacities of an American citizen. I would take him by the hand and lift him up and sustain him. I would never oppress or depress him because he is poor, ignorant, and a colored man. I would give him every opportunity of improving his physical, mental, and moral condition; and I would oppose and denounce any man or any party who would undertake to proscribe him and deny him these rights and these privileges. The laws, the constitution of my country, guarantee to the negro these rights, and I will never violate them. But while I would endeavor most faithfully to do full and complete justice to the colored man, let me once for all say that I would never consent that the white people of the South, the white people of the country, should subordinate their rights, their attainments, their capacities, their prestige, to the colored man. On this subject my convictions are firmly fixed—immutably fixed and settled."

General Ransom died in 1904, at the age of seventy-eight. He lived to see many of his cherished hopes in regard to the reuniting of his country realized. In accomplishing this end he played no small part. The conciliatory spirit manifested by him and other Southern men, like Lamar, and Hill, and Gordon, should receive permanent recognition from the nation. The movement to erect in the capitol grounds at Raleigh a monument to his memory, is one which should commend itself to the generosity of a grateful people.

The Peabody Education Fund

By R. W. D. CONNOR,

Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina

"Education: A debt due from present to future generations."—George Peabody

The recent decision of the Peabody Education Board to dissolve its trust is an announcement to the public that its work has been done, the noble purpose of its founder has been accomplished. There is a world of meaning wrapped up in this simple fact. For more than thirty years the Peabody Education Fund has been a potent factor in the educational life of the Southern States. Created in 1867 by Mr. George Peabody, a native of Massachusetts, but at the time a wealthy banker of London, and administered through subsequent years by Dr. Barnas Sears and Dr. J. L. M. Curry, educational statesmen, it has been a steadily flowing fountain of timely financial aid and moral inspiration to a brave people in their efforts to beat down the forces of poverty and illiteracy. In its history may be read the history of the educational revival of recent years in the Southern States, which has received nowhere else so complete an acknowledgment of its success as in the dissolution of the Peabody trust.

The destitute condition of the Southern States in 1865, politically, socially and financially, is too well known to bear repetition here. In no respect, however, was their condition more deplorable than in their educational life. Save in a few colleges, struggling for mere existence, their seats of higher education were completely overthrown. Their splendid systems of private academies were almost wholly destroyed. There were no normal or industrial schools. Not a single one of all the Southern States supported a system of public schools, and what is worse, there was no public sentiment favoring them. In Virginia, people and legislators doubted the wisdom of the constitutional requirements for public schools. In North Carolina, the public school houses, remains of the system built up with so much labor and ability by Calvin H. Wiley, were mostly "occupied by squatters," and among the people there was an alarming indifference to education. Of South Carolina Dr. Sears said that "a more complete

state of prostration as to all means of education is rarely witnessed." In Georgia, offers of aid were treated with indifference. In Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi "neither law nor public sentiment required free schools." No public schools existed in Louisiana outside of New Orleans. Texas had used her magnificent school fund for military purposes. According to the testimony of her own governor, no State in the Union was behind Arkansas in educational provisions. The situation in Tennessee was little better than that in the other States.

It was while affairs were in this almost helpless condition that George Peabody, "moved by the Holy Ghost," came to the rescue "of the suffering South for the good of the whole country." Having already elicited the admiring applause of the civilized world, by public gifts surpassing in their munificence and in the wisdom of their conception anything previously known to history, he now added to the long list the greatest and noblest of them all. Of the many gems in the coronet which encircles his immortal brow, none other shines with such lustre as that which symbolizes his great gift to the cause of education in the Southern States.

Though Mr. Peabody had long cherished the idea and had fully discussed it with confidential friends, it was not until February 7th, 1867, that his purpose was made public. On that date he addressed a letter to those to whom he wished to commit the trust. Their names were a guarantee of the generosity of his motive, the largeness of his purpose, and the wisdom of its execution. They were: "Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, of Massachusetts; Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York; Right Rev. Charles P. McIlvaine, of Ohio; General U. S. Grant, of the United States Army; Admiral D. G. Farragut, of the United States Navy; Hon. William C. Rives, of Virginia; Hon. John H. Clifford, of Massachusetts; Hon. William Aiken, of South Carolina; William M. Evarts, Esq., of New York; Hon. William A. Graham, of North Carolina; Charles Macalester, Esq., of Pennsylvania; George W. Riggs, Esq., of Washington; Samuel Wetmore, Esq., of New York; Edward A. Bradford, Esq., of Louisiana; George N. Eaton, Esq., of Maryland; and George Peabody Russell, Esq., of Massachusetts." The letter, he said, was about a subject which had long occupied his mind before he left England:

"I refer," he continued, "to the educational needs of those portions of our beloved and common country which have suffered from the destructive ravages, and the not less disastrous consequences, of civil war.

"With my advancing years, my attachment to my native land has become more devoted. My hope and faith in its successful and glorious future have grown brighter and stronger; and now, looking forward beyond my stay on earth, as may be permitted to one who has passed the limit of three-score-and-ten years, I see our country, united and prosperous, emerging from the clouds which still surround her, taking a higher rank among the nations, and becoming richer and more powerful than ever before.

"But to make her prosperity more than superficial, her moral and intellectual development should keep pace with her material growth, and, in those portions of our nation to which I referred, the urgent and pressing physical needs of an almost impoverished people must for some years preclude them from making, by unaided effort, such advances in education, and such progress, in the diffusion of knowledge, among all classes, as every lover of his country must earnestly desire.

"I feel most deeply, therefore, that it is the duty and privilege of the more favored and wealthy portions of our nation to assist those who are less fortunate; and, with the wish to discharge as far as I may be able my own responsibility in this matter, as well as to gratify my desire to aid those to whom I am bound by so many ties of attachment and regard, I give to you, gentlemen, most of whom have been my personal and especial friends, the sum of one million of dollars, to be by you and your successors held in trust, and the income thereof used and applied in your discretion for the promotion and encouragement of intellectual, moral, or industrial education among the young of the more destitute portions of the Southern and Southwestern States of our Union; my purpose being that the benefits intended shall be distributed among the entire population, without other distinctions than their needs and the opportunities of usefulness to them.

"In making this gift I am aware that the fund derived from it can but aid the States which I wish to benefit in their own exertions to diffuse the blessings of education and morality. But if this endowment shall encourage those now anxious for the light of knowledge, and stimulate to new efforts the many good and noble men who cherish the high purpose of placing our country foremost, not only in power, but in the intelligence and virtue of her citizens, it will have accomplished all that I can hope."

In addition to the one million dollars referred to, Mr. Peabody donated bonds of the State of Mississippi amounting, with interest, to about eleven hundred thousand dollars. Two years later he added other securities to the amount of one million

dollars, together with bonds of the State of Florida, which, with overdue coupons, amounted to \$384,000. But both Florida and Mississippi later repudiated their bonds, so that the board of trustees realized nothing from them. Even with this reduction the gift was the largest, up to that time, ever made by a private individual for educational purposes.

In the management and use of this fund the board of trustees was given an absolutely free hand. Power was given to it to make all necessary rules and regulations; to obtain an act of incorporation; to provide for the expenses of the trustees and of any agents they chose to appoint; to fill vacancies in the membership of the board; and, after thirty years, if it were deemed expedient, to close the trust and distribute the funds, not less than two-thirds to educational purposes in the Southern States, the balance wherever the board thought best. The only condition placed upon the trustees was the request that Mr. Winthrop be chairman, and Governor Fish and Bishop McIlvane vice-chairmen.

As distinguished as were the names, as eminent as was the ability, as high as were the characters of the members of the original board, subsequent additions, if they could not surpass, certainly have not fallen below them. Among these have been four presidents of the United States—Hayes, McKinley, Cleveland, and Roosevelt; two chief justices of the Supreme Court of the United States—Waite and Fuller; distinguished members of State judiciaries, like Chief Justice Manning, of Louisiana, and Chief Justice Endicott, of Massachusetts; great lawyers, like Joseph Choate and Hoke Smith; great financiers, like Drexel, Childs and Morgan; great preachers, like Bishop Whipple and Bishop Lawrence; great statesmen, like Hoar and Olney; great scholars, like Gilman. What other cause than that of education could have enlisted the active support and coöperation of men of such commanding abilities, such large experience, such varied interests, as these?

Such, then, was the famous Peabody trust. Its fate lay wholly within the hands of the trustees. Upon the wisdom of their policy depended the results hoped for by its generous founder.

The board held its first meeting and effected an organization February 8th, 1867, in the city of Washington. The second

session was held in New York city March 20th, at which time Dr. Barnas Sears, president of Brown University, was elected general agent. To his wisdom, tact, and exhaustless energy, much of the success of the Peabody board is due. It was he who outlined the policy of the board and carried it through to its marvellous success, becoming, as Mr. Winthrop said, "a perfect pilot of a perfect scheme."

This policy and its execution divides the history of the trust into two distinct and well-defined periods. The first, embracing a period of about twelve years, 1867 to 1879, was devoted almost entirely to building up State systems of free primary instruction. The success of this work created, of course, a demand for trained teachers. The second period, therefore, was devoted to efforts to supply this demand by the establishment and development of institutes and normal schools.

The prosecution of this work was a most delicate task. As is the case with all people who have suffered defeat the people of the Southern States were in an extremely sensitive mood, and looked with suspicion upon the Greeks bearing gifts. The attitude assumed by the board toward those whom they wished to help was therefore a matter of the first importance. In this the trustees were most wise and most fortunate. They had no terms to dictate to a prostrate people; no foreign theories to force upon them; no assumption of superiority to wound their pride. They did manifest a desire to coöperate with the people in their own efforts to rebuild their States; they did show an earnest intention of consulting those whom they were to aid, as to the best method of doing so; they did make a most earnest effort to approach their great work from the point of view of the people in whose interest they labored. Guided by the generous spirit of George Peabody, the trustees at no time manifested any disposition to interfere with State laws, or to break down social or political barriers which circumstances had forced the people to erect.

With the same spirit in which they were approached, the people of the Southern States received the gift. In his second letter of trust to the board, written in 1869, Mr. Peabody thanked them with all his heart for the "cordial spirit" with which they received the trust, and for the energetic effort they were making to carry out the plans of the board. From beginning to end har-

monious coöperation between benefactors and beneficiaries marked the administration of the trust.

In this spirit the trustees and their general agent approached their task of inducing the States to establish and maintain systems of free primary instruction. This was "the objective point, the goal of all efforts, the animus of all addresses, the underlying motive of all appropriations." In the prevailing conditions, it was necessary to work through individual schools, but the general agent always looked beyond these to the end he contemplated; and aid was given to such schools in proportion to the influence they would exert on the general system. This policy grew out of the conviction that a small number of strong schools, certain to succeed, was better than a large number of weak ones, likely to fail. To have scattered their fund all over the Southern States in dribblets, without giving any schools sufficient assistance to maintain life, would have invited failure. But examples of success, not of failure, were needed to induce the Southern States to take hold of the work. Of the great majority of the people, those who were not prejudiced against free schools were ignorant of their nature and operation. Ignorance would soon harden into prejudice if the people saw only inferior schools. Men may be convinced of the unsatisfactory character of existing schools, and yet, if they never see any that are models of excellence, may despond of ever seeing much improvement. So thought the Peabody board and its able agent.

Following this idea the board adopted a comprehensive plan for the general improvement of schools rather than the doling out of charitable aid to all who were in want of the means of education. The fund was anything but a charity fund; the board anything but an eleemosynary board. So far from adopting the charity idea of helping the weak, the trustees deliberately adopted the contrary policy of helping only the strong. "We aid those most," wrote the general agent, "who help themselves most. If the people do little, we do little; if they do nothing, we do nothing. It is best for all the States to be helped just when they are taking hold of the schools in earnest." One-fourth the cost of establishing and maintaining the school—this was the proportion usually contributed from the Peabody Fund, and this only on condition that the remaining three-fourths be pledged by some

responsible person, or by the municipal government of the place. In 1871 \$108,900 contributed by the Peabody trustees was the direct cause of the expenditure by the people themselves of \$550,000. During the first ten years of the administration of the trust the sum distributed was \$984,450. Mr. Winthrop estimated that this had involved an expenditure by the people of no less than \$10,000,000. The greater part of this large sum went into permanent improvements, for in selecting schools to which aid should be given, not present conditions, but future results, were considered. In no case would aid be given to schools which would cease to exist after the withdrawal of Peabody support. As early as 1876 Dr. Sears was able to report that twenty-four cities to which aid had been given amounting to \$135,000, had assumed the entire support of their schools; and that aid had been withdrawn from "more than two hundred village and country schools," which had become self-supporting. In this way all over the Southern States in favorable communities were "sprinkled" model schools which were destined, as Dr. Sears so clearly foresaw, to develop into State systems.

His vision was not misleading. In every Southern State today a system of public schools is maintained. The dozens of model schools planted by Dr. Sears and the Peabody board have grown into thousands. Practically every town or city of two thousand inhabitants in the States included in Mr. Peabody's gift supports a system of public schools; and hundreds of villages and rural districts maintain public schools by local taxation. Local taxation for school purposes has become the watchword of the educational forces of the Southern States, and around this rallying cry day by day, the great common people are gathering. To bring this to pass millions of dollars have been expended by a people whose country less than forty years ago suffered all "the destructive ravages and not less disastrous consequences of civil war." Most effectively did Dr. Sears and the Peabody trustees, with their co-laborers, accomplish the first part of their great task.

The year 1879 has been designated as the time at which the first period of the history of the trust closed. During this period \$1,136,750 had been distributed in the Southern States, about 90 per cent. of which was devoted to the development of schools.

By the close of this period the common school system had been adopted by every State contemplated in Mr. Peabody's endowment. In 1879, therefore, Dr. Sears was able to write: "Of the two grand objects which the board has from the beginning had in view, namely, the promotion of common school education, and the professional training of teachers, the former, or primary one, has been so far attained that it may, in great part, be safely left in the hands of the people, and our chief attention henceforth be given to the latter." The time was now come, therefore, when the sentiment of the people must be shaped towards this great end; and with the same wisdom and energy which he had displayed in the development of the common schools, Dr. Sears now began to prepare the way to add this "crowning part" to the State systems.

But it was not to be his good fortune to do more than begin this work. Worn out by his long and courageous struggle with the forces of illiteracy he dropped his task and sank to rest, September 6, 1880. On the third of the following February the board elected as his successor, J. L. M. Curry, soldier, diplomat, statesman, teacher—a man to whom the "little ones were dear." It so happened, therefore, that the two periods in the history of the trust are almost exactly co-incident with the services of the two general agents. As Dr. Sears was the great leader in the organization of free public schools, so Dr. Curry became the great leader in the development of the profession of teaching in the Southern States. It may almost be said that he created the profession there.

It has already been stated that at the time of the creation of the Peabody trust there was not a normal school in all the Southern States, and no demand for any. Twelve years had wrought some change, not so much in sentiment, as in conditions. In some of the States feeble beginnings had already been made when Dr. Curry took up the work. In Louisiana and in Tennessee, for example, excellent normal schools, since become famous, were supported largely by the Peabody fund. But there were no well supported State normals yet to be found. The general public had not yet reached that stage in the development of the school systems when the need for such institutions was felt. The teachers, indeed, felt the need of better training, but their

pleas for it were more often than not put down to self-seeking ambition. It is not a difficult matter to bring a people to see the need of good schools, but strange as it may seem, the task is doubly hard to make them see that the key to the situation is the teacher; that the level of the teacher determines the level of the school. Normal schools, as Dr. Sears said, though first in the order of nature, are last in the conception of the people. Let it be known that the State proposes to expend a large sum of money in the training of teachers, and a cry at once goes up that the interests of the children are to be sacrificed for the sake of a few selfish and ambitious teachers. In 1881 this was the prevailing view among the people; and legislative bodies are rarely, if even ahead of the people, in their ideas of public policy.

It was this view that Dr. Curry set himself to combat. Every way in which it was possible to touch public opinion, he used; every opportunity to mould it that came to him, or that he could make, he seized. As Dr. Edwin A. Alderman says: "He had the genius for giving himself out, and the equipment of intellect and genius necessary for his many-sided duties. Before the legislatures of every State, from the Potomac to the Gulf, from college platforms, in great national gatherings, by country cross-roads, and in little villages wherein some impulse stirred a community to better its life, his voice was heard for twenty years." It is said that he addressed more legislative bodies as a private citizen than any other man of his day. "His long political experience, glowing eloquence, educational wisdom, and admirable blending of 'fiery zeal' and conservative policy, lifted him at once to a position above governors and legislators, and made him the 'guide, philosopher, and friend' both of educators and statesmen." Where Curry led they soon learned to follow. "And so," to quote one of his most eloquent pupils, "that solemn, majestic thing, called public opinion, got born, and a few men as earnest as death became somehow what we call a movement, and the movement, led by this splendid figure, wherein were blended the grace and charm of the old time with the vigor and freedom of the new, became a crusade, and young scholars had their imaginations touched by it and their creative instincts awakened by it, and the preachers saw their way clear to push it along, and the politicians, ever sensitive to the lightest wind of popular desire,

felt its stirrings in the air." The thing was done; men began to see that the strength of the teacher was the strength of the school; and all over the Southern States went up a demand for strong teachers. One by one the States fell into line until this "crowning part"—normal schools—had been placed as the cap-stone of every State system of public instruction in the Southern States, except one.

No part of its work was regarded by the Peabody board with greater satisfaction than this. As the years went by and the influence of this work became more and more apparent, the donations from the Peabody fund were made more and more liberal. In the year 1875-1876 only 7.5 per cent. of the contributions was made to teacher-training—a term which includes not only normal school work, but also that of institutes and educational journals, to both of which the board contributed generously. During the next year the percentage used for this purpose was 18.4; then 26.1, and in 1879-1880 it rose to 76.4. After this, with the exception of two years, when it was 71.6 and 72.8, it never fell below 81.5. In the year 1892-1893 the percentage used for teacher-training was 100.

During the year 1901-1902 there were 41 State normal schools in the States in which the Peabody board worked. Many of them received their first impulse from the Peabody fund. They received annual appropriations from the public treasuries to the amount of \$426,974. They owned property valued at \$3,415,496. Their faculties were composed of 483 trained and experienced teachers. They taught 7,694 students who were themselves preparing to be teachers. These figures are not large, but the revolution in public appreciation of trained teachers, which they reveal, is large with meaning. "The nation that has the best schools, will be the first nation," says Jules Simon. "If it is not so today, it will be so tomorrow." To which let us add: The nation which has the best teachers will have the best schools. If it is not so today, it will be so tomorrow. The people of the Southern States are daily growing in appreciation of this truth. This step forward they owe largely to the wise expenditure of a few hundred thousand dollars, "plus the heart and brain of Curry and Sears and their colleagues and followers."

It would be absurd, of course, to suppose that the work of the

Peabody trust was confined to the narrow limits herein discussed, as broad as they are. In every way in which it was possible to touch the life of a people for its betterment, the Peabody trust touched the life of the people of the Southern States, and everywhere it acted as an inspiration. Industrially, politically, and socially, they are indebted to it for much that is best in their lives.

To be sure no one will claim for the Peabody board the sole honor for the great educational progress of the Southern States. There are dozens of other agencies which rightly claim a share in this work. In 1882 came the Slater fund, \$1,000,000, for the education of the negro. Later has come the Southern Education Conference and the organization of the General Education Board and the Southern Education Board, the result of whose work it is yet too early to estimate. But it is not to underestimate the importance or the significance of these agencies to say that they received their inspiration from the philanthropy of George Peabody and the work of the Peabody board, which held out to them its strong helping hand. Then, too, it is not to be supposed that the Southern States, in an era of public education, would have held aloof, if left alone, from this wonderful world movement. The spirit of the age must have made itself felt. And yet in a certain sense the great school systems of these States, as they are today, are the result of the work of the Peabody board. This board and its agent suggested the idea to the Southern people. The model schools established in central localities first persuaded them that they could establish and support such schools; and induced them to do so in spite of their poverty. The idea had been "projected upon the spirit of a self-reliant and unconquerable people," and great results followed. But the gardener who prepared the ground and sowed the seed is no less entitled to a share of the fruit than he who nourished and cultivated the plant.

The public school systems of the Southern States are lasting memorials no less to the generosity of Peabody, the patriotism of the Peabody board, the courage and wisdom of Sears and Curry than to the wise foresight of the Southern people. Each year sees them widen their sphere of influence; each year sees them send their roots deeper and deeper into the hearts of the

common people. And though there may be found yet an occasional advocate of the long fossilized idea that it is not just for the State to educate one man's child with another man's money, the voices of these idle dreamers are drowned in the loud appeals everywhere heard in behalf of the childhood of the land. The ideas of Peabody, of Sears, and of Curry have captured the Southern people; they are committed, with a unanimity and a determination not found in any previous policy, to the training of all the children of all the people at public expense; and whatever else it may be found necessary to sacrifice in the future, the great common schools of the great common people shall abide.

Though it has been impossible in this brief article even to mention any of the services the Peabody board rendered the nation aside from its school work, one such phase of its great service must not be passed over. Its work was a national work, as broad as the nation's spirit, as enduring as its life.

George Peabody came to the rescue of the suffering South for the good of "the whole country." His gift, as Mr. Winthrop said, was the "earliest signal manifestation of a spirit of reconciliation" between the sections. It involved not only a recognition of the great losses the war had inflicted upon the Southern States, but also the responsibility of the nation for that loss. The rebuilding of these States was a national, not a sectional, problem; the dangers and weaknesses of poverty and illiteracy are not local. The first real step toward reconstruction and reunion was taken when leading men of Virginia and of Louisiana, of North Carolina and of South Carolina and of Maryland, met with those of Massachusetts and of Pennsylvania and of New York, in "a little upper chamber" in Willard's Hotel in Washington, for devising means to build up the waste places which the war had left behind it. These waste places were found not only in the broad fields of the Southern States, but likewise in the nation's bleeding heart. In the work of redeveloping the one and of healing the other, the Peabody board called to the nation's service two great leaders whose lives, rich as they were with meaning, stood first of all for Americanism. For more than thirty years Sears and Curry went up and down the land teaching and preaching the principles of nationality. Sears, of Northern

birth; Curry, of Southern birth—the one captured the hearts of Southern men by his love and sympathy, the other won the ears of Northern men by his eloquence and earnestness. Behind them, upholding their hands, encouraging their hearts, stood the Peabody board, composed of the leading business men, statesmen, scholars and teachers of the nation, regardless of sections, distributing the wealth of the great Northern banker for the benefit of the Southern child—a constant reminder of the oneness of the American people.

Some Contemporary American Essayists

BY WILLIAM P. FEW.

Dean and Professor of English in Trinity College

Human life is in such an intimate sense the subject matter of literature that every competent critic of literature must be a student of life. So it has come to pass that many English men of letters, such as Bacon, Addison, and Lamb, have written essays on the art of living. Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, the most distinctly literary magazine in the country, has lately printed a volume of essays in which the note most often struck is not letters but life.*

Under such subjects as *The Amateur Spirit*, *Indifferentism*, *the Life of a College Professor*, *College Professors and the Public*, and *Hawthorne at North Adams*, Mr. Perry has treated some interesting phases of present day American life. The central theme of the book—the significance of the amateur spirit in carrying forward the work of our modern world—is illustrated from many fields, with abundance of knowledge and sureness of judgment. The title essay is an illuminating discussion of the “possibility of combining the professional’s skill with the zest and enthusiasm of the amateur.” The amateur as here defined is the man who practices an art or sport—painting or golf—because of his love of it, and not for money; while a professional is one who makes his sport or his art his constant business. There must be a marked distinction between the amateur and the professional spirit and this distinction manifests itself in many forms of activity. On the side of the amateur is spontaneity, versatility, plasticity, enthusiasm, the capacity for taking high cuts, while on the side of the professional is trained skill, mature knowledge, sureness, effectiveness. The amateur’s plasticity of mind and trick of turning his hand to many things were characteristic qualities of the American pioneer. “The knack of getting things done and learning the rules afterwards” has worked wonders in America. The self-made man rather than the trained worker is still perhaps our representative man.

**The Amateur Spirit*. By Bliss Perry. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904.

Mr. Perry is evidently much in sympathy with the amateur, but he gives a fair estimate of the superior value of the trained professional. "The real workaday progress, the solid irrettraceable advance in any art or profession, has commonly been made by the professional. Pasteur was a professional, and Helmholtz, and Huxley. John Marshall was a professional jurist. Mr. John Sargent is a professional painter of portraits, and Mr. Secretary Hay is a professional diplomatist."

While too much praise cannot be given to the multitude of self-made Americans who have contributed so largely to making this the richest and most prosperous country in the world, yet there is need today to emphasize the value of trained experts, especially in statecraft and diplomacy. The spoilsman and the amateur reformer are alike enemies to the public good. Already in America there is demand for specially trained men for the professions of law, medicine, the army, the church; but even here more rather than less emphasis needs to be laid. Ours must be not "a nation of amateurs" but a nation of professionals, if it is to hold its own in the coming struggles. Professional in method and amateur in spirit, is Mr. Perry's counsel of perfection. "Is it an impossible ideal, this combination of qualities, this union of the generous spirit of the amateur with the method of the professional?" "The personal enthusiasm, the individual initiative, the boundless zest of the American amateur must penetrate, illuminate, idealize, the brute force, the irresistibly on-sweeping mass, of our vast industrial democracy."

The essay on Indifferentism approaches the subject from the side of the man "who cares little." As a text Mr. Perry uses Signor Pococurante, the consummate indifferentist in Voltaire's "Candide," the wittiest book of the eighteenth century. Signor Pococurante becomes the type of the man whom nothing pleases, in whom the critical faculty is highly developed, who sees faults everywhere, who dislikes everything he possesses. Pococurantism is as old as Solomon; and Mr. Perry studies the phenomenon as it is found in the many varieties of disillusioned men who have felt that the game is not worth the candle.

It is a far cry from Pococurante, a Venetian nobleman of the eighteenth century, to America of the twentieth century; but our excessive devotion to the utilities, the fierce competitive struggle

in which we live, our measuring of life by material standards, lead as swiftly to world-weariness and indifferentism as the half-hearted dilettanteism of the sheerest worlding. But "these contemporary forms of indifferentism are not final. We shall doubtless specialize more, rather than less, and yet the narrowing tendencies of absorption in one's own specialty may be resisted." "A quiet mind that recalls the enduring lessons of history, a meditative mind that perceives the secret of vitality in true books and true men, a sane mind that sees life wholesomely and humanly—that is what one would cultivate if he would share the inexhaustible freshness, the unceasing energy, which make the daily gladness of the world."

In the two essays on the College Professor, Mr. Perry knows his ground thoroughly. He has an intimate knowledge of academic conditions in the United States. He was for a number of years a popular professor of English literature at Williams College and afterwards at Princeton. In his youth he sat at the feet of German professors, though it is doubtful if he was ever wholly under their spell; but he came to understand their passion for scholarship and to appreciate the value of technical training. He likewise saw that your famous expert is often but a segment of a man,—over-developed in one direction, atrophied in all others. As an antidote for this narrow and deadening sterility to which the college professor is peculiarly liable, Mr. Perry offers Russ Pratt's formula of life as given by Russ's adopted daughter: "He saws wood, sits in the house, and goes down street." "Is that not an admirable formula? Labor, reflection, social contact!"

Having been for years identified with colleges and being now a "literary fellow" with a cosmopolitan point of view, Mr. Perry writes with full knowledge of the ways of academic communities and searching criticisms of the glories and the limitations of the academic career, of the value and even of the foibles of the college professor.

In his "Routine and Ideals"* Mr. Le Baron Russell Briggs writes of education not as an outside observer, but as a college man of wide experience. Mr. Briggs, for so many years the dean

*Routine and Ideals. By Le Baron Russell Briggs, Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1904.

of Harvard College, is easily one of the most popular and useful college officers in the country. He has been a prime favorite with many generations of Harvard men, and to the general public he has already made good his right to speak on educational subjects, by his first published book, "School, College and Character."

It is significant that Mr. Perry closes his essay on College Professors and the Public with a practicable application of the fine words of a venerable professor, spoken in reply to a young colleague who had complained of the waste of time from the half-hour spent each morning at the required chapel service: "If you are turning a grindstone, every moment is precious; but if you are doing a man's work, the inspired moments are precious." So Dean Briggs calls the essay (really published addresses, they are) sermons or a single sermon; and the text is twofold: "Be thou faithful unto death," and "Where there is no vision the people perish." The text is a most apt one; for "Routine and Ideals" is a call to young men to be "there" and be "there" not only in the high and ambitious moments of life, but on the "obscure dead levels that take the heart out of any one who does not see the glory of common things." But this essay is not a glorification of drudgery; routine is a means to an end. It must have an ideal in it and round about it. "In such a practical life as every man or woman ought to lead, such a practical life as educated men and women are bound to lead or be false to their trust, it is the vision that abides and commands."

In three other essays, Harvard and the Individual, Discipline in School and College, and The Mistakes of College Life, Dean Briggs discusses practical phases of education. He writes with a candor and simplicity rare in educational discussions. There can at no time be the faintest suspicion that he is crying his own wares. He is not a retainer in behalf of any favorite theories of education. He speaks, out of a full experience, of the few certain, fundamental things that we really know about this much talked of subject. He himself says in the preface that the book contains no new ideas and only a few old ones. This sort of compelling candor pervades the entire book, and makes it most refreshing and stimulating. I have rarely read a book that so reassures me as to the validity of educational processes and the value of educational results. Education—its methods and results—is as

vital as any other question, particularly in our democratic America, where so much in our civilization is experimental and problematical. A perfectly frank and honest discussion of what is being done and achieved in education is valuable. Such a discussion Dean Briggs furnishes us in this book and its predecessor.

The book is brimful of the attractive personality of the author, and it is written in the easy, winning style, of which Dean Briggs is always master. His quiet humor, his sympathy with all kinds of men, even incorrigible freshmen, his enthusiasm for his work, his untiring devotion to the difficult task of saving college boys, all stand out from every page of the book. These qualities combine to make "Routine and Ideals" one of the few readable and humanly interesting books that deal with the subject of education.

Dean Briggs has pointed out how boys may be developed into men, and how character may be made in men by three things—intelligence, constant practice, and something hard to define, but not too fancifully, called an ideal. In a recently published small volume entitled "The Business Career in its Public Relations,"* Mr. Albert Shaw has set forth what these same qualities have accomplished in the material upbuilding of this country. We are accustomed to hear only abuse of American business methods and commercialism in general. On the other hand Mr. Shaw believes that we are not at heart—appearances sometimes to the contrary notwithstanding—in this splendid country of ours, engaged in a mad struggle and race for wealth. "We are engaged rather in the greatest effort ever made in the world for the upbuilding of a higher civilization."

Economic progress and the increase of wealth have diffused general well-being and opened the door to a larger majority of men than was ever known in any country before the day of the practical utilization of steam power and other great inventions which led to the rise of "capitalism." One may be keenly alive to the hideous evils and inequalities of modern industrialism and yet be glad to believe, with Mr. Shaw, that this mightiest force of our time may be made to furnish a soil and an atmosphere in which idealism can grow, bud, blossom, and bear glorious fruit. But

*The Business Career in its Public Relations. By Albert Shaw, Ph.D., Editor of the American Review of Reviews. San Francisco: Paul Elder & Company, 1904.

this result can only be obtained when the highest ethical standards have been applied to the conduct of business affairs. Business men must feel their responsibility for the general welfare, and be animated by a desire to be of service to their fellow-men. Already this is coming to pass in America. Business men today constitute the most progressive and constructive class among us, and in the main their influence has made for progress and general human betterment.

In recognition of this, America's chief contribution to civilization, and with a purpose to enthrone in the conduct of business affairs the same ethical standards that belong rightly to governmental administration, to educational administration, or to the best professional life, Mr. H. Weinstock has established in the University of California a lectureship on "The Morals of Trade." The first lectures on this foundation were last year given by Mr. Albert Shaw, the editor of the *American Review of Reviews*, and these lectures compose the book which has lately come from the press. Mr. Shaw is a trained scholar, who has had large observation of business, social, and political conditions in this country. He is a constructive, not a destructive critic—and, like most other men who bear an active part in the great onward movement of our time, he is an optimist, even if sometimes in spite of the facts. Such an appeal as this book makes to young men who will enter business, must do good; and the book ought to be widely read, particularly in the South, where poverty has been our great curse and where material progress is now the first step toward that high standard of civilization which we are destined to reach.

Dealing more specifically with literary subjects than either of these three volumes, but withal vital and helpful in its treatment of American conditions, is Mr. Paul Elmer More's "Shelburne Essays."* Like some others of our most cultivated men, Mr. More does not regard modern progress with complacency, but looks with the utmost doubt and anxiety upon the drift of the times. The contentions of commerce are to him a desolation and a woe, and his ear does not hearken after the "indistinguishable roar" of the streets or the noisy jargon of the market-place. To

*Shelburne Essays—First Series; by Paul Elmer More. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.

remove himself "far from this our war," he took upon himself to live two years as a hermit among the pine forests of Maine, in the peaceful valley of the Androscoggin river. These essays are the first fruits of this sojourn in the wilderness. They show a wide range of subjects, from "A Hermit's Notes on Thoreau" to "The Religious Ground of Humanitarianism."

Mr. More has read widely in the literature of the world. He was for several years an instructor in Harvard University, where his chief work lay in the fields of Greek and Latin literature and the philosophy of ancient India. He is now the literary editor of the *New York Evening Post*. To an uncommonly wide acquaintance with the literature of the past—he confesses that he was actually better acquainted with the aspirations and emotions of the old dwellers on the Ganges than with those of the modern toiler by the Hudson or the Potomac—he adds the born critic's penetration, keen appreciation of literature, and sanity of judgment. For their knowledge, insight, and interpretative power these essays make up one of the most significant contributions to critical writing that have appeared in America within recent years.

These four volumes, particularly the first three, are alike in that they are enquiries into the real forces that are making for American civilization. They—each in its own way—reflect some of the most wholesome tendencies of our time. They are stimulating, for they are apt to make Americans more hopeful of their country; and it is only in epochs of hopefulness that worthy achievements may be expected.

BOOK REVIEWS

GREAT ENGLISHMEN OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. By Sidney Lee. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904,—xxiii., 337 pp.

THE TEMPER OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. By Barrett Wendell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904,—viii., 360 pp.

These two volumes emphasize the fact of the growing intellectual intercourse between England and America. The lectures of Mr. Sidney Lee, one of the most scholarly critics of England, were delivered at Lowell Institute, in Boston, in 1903; those of Professor Barrett Wendell, of Harvard University, were delivered at Trinity College, Cambridge, on the Clark foundation, in the year 1902-3. Mr. Lee is one of a long line of English scholars who have lectured in this country. Professor Wendell is the first American scholar to deliver a series of lectures concerning English literature at an English university. The latter is naturally more concerned about his mission and message. He is much concerned about "the world-need of a closer union, of better mutual understanding," between the two countries. He says in his preface: "Loyal Englishmen can never be Americans, nor loyal Americans Englishmen; but no patriotic loyalty can ever affect the truth that Englishmen and Americans are ancestrally brethren. And whoever does his best to strengthen the sense and the ties of our kinship does a good deed for the future of this puzzling world." His visit to Cambridge led to some warm personal friendships and, furthermore, brought to the author a "new, wonderful, lasting sense of human fellowship" with the English worthies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Both of the lecturers, by a striking coincidence, spoke of Shakspeare, Spenser and Bacon; but with Mr. Lee they are the central figures in a study of the Renaissance in England, while with Mr. Wendell they are studied only as contrasts with the seventeenth century writers. Neither writer has done work of a higher order than is to be found in these volumes.

Mr. Sidney Lee, as one of the editors of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and especially as the author of the latest

and most authoritative life of Shakspeare, has established his right to speak authoritatively on Elizabethan literature. The book now under review is the result at once of the most scientific study of the minutest details in the literary history of the period, and of a certain large and vital interpretation of the age as a whole. One cannot praise too highly either the accuracy and breadth of knowledge displayed or the literary style with which the most striking features of the Elizabethan age are delineated. It is a fascinating book either for the scholar or for the cultivated reader of general intelligence. The introductory chapter is a summary of the principal tendencies and achievements of the Elizabethan—or Renaissance—period, which begins with "the wonderful enlightenment of Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and culminates in the achievements of Bacon and Shakspeare." The passion for extending the limits of human knowledge, the love of beauty that followed the recovery of classical literature and the study of contemporary European literature, the expansion of thought that came with Copernicus and Columbus, the literary influence of the Bible, the newly awakened national spirit—all these are sketched by the author in a few suggestive, and at times eloquent, sentences. All the men of that time—and notably the five men he studies in the later chapters of the book—had something of the versatility of the age; men of letters were also men of action, and *vice versa*.

"The children of the Renaissance scorned narrowness of outlook. . . . Avowed specialism was foreign to the large temper of the times." Hence arises, however—except in Bacon and Shakspeare—the failure "to do the one thing of isolated pre-eminence which might have rewarded efficient concentration of effort." Mr. Lee puts his finger too upon the strange paradox of this age—the alliance of good and evil; "the better angel" and "the worser spirit" of Shakspeare's Sonnets "represent with singular accuracy the ethical temper of the age." This paradox of the period as a whole is writ large in the lives of More, Bacon, and Raleigh, whose careers were strangely inconsistent with the ideals they expressed in their writings. Even Sidney and Spenser "strained their nerves until they broke in death, in pursuit of such will-o'-the-wisps as political or military fame," while Shakspeare himself, who "mastered the whole scale of human aspirations," had "worldly ambitions of commonplace calibre."

The five chapters giving the salient facts and the principal characteristics of these six great Elizabethans are models of biography and criticism. The seventh chapter, entitled "Foreign Influences on Shakespeare," is one of the most illuminating essays yet written on the great dramatist. In addition to the uniform excellence of the whole book should be mentioned the full table of contents, the bibliographies at the beginning of each chapter, and the carefully prepared index.

Professor Wendell's book lacks the charm of Mr. Lee's—the wealth of personal incidents and characteristics. In it is evident, however, the same thoroughness of work, the same genuine scholarship; there is an added note of thoughtfulness. The book is really a setting forth of a thesis. Believing that literature is "the lasting expression in words of the meaning of life" and "the unconscious expression of national temper," the author has endeavored, first, to get at the essential characteristics of the English people in the Elizabethan age; these he finds to be spontaneity, enthusiasm and versatility. The first part of the seventeenth century saw the decline of the drama and the lyric, which decline was synchronous with the disintegration of the national temper, the breaking up of the ardent youthful integrity. Even the prose of the seventeenth century lacks the fervid integrity of the Elizabethan age—"the rhythmic ebb and flow which should suffuse meaning with the throbbing strength of half-repressed imaginative fervor." The most characteristic note of all the men of the mid-seventeenth century is that of personal isolation, even in the "clashing tragedy of the civil war"—a change from the national to the deliberately individual point of view. National integrity is lost in the misunderstandings and prejudices of the Cavaliers and Puritans. "When the world is ablaze, only those can express themselves who stand aside," and so we have the individual note in Walton, Sir Thomas Browne, Vaughan, Marvell, Hobbes—most of all, in Milton, whose solitude "is rather the inevitable solitude of his disintegrating time;" he is a great man, "inevitably apart." The national integrity was restored again in the age of Dryden, when, as John Richards Green says, modern England begins. Mr. Wendell suggests in a brief chapter at the end the characteristics of the age which began with the Restoration.

The main point of the book, however, is to show the divergence of the paths of England and New England, the Elizabethan age being the period common to both countries. One of the main tendencies of the Elizabethan age was that toward Puritanism, which, however, found its expression, not in literature, but in the establishment of a republic beyond the seas. English Puritanism became more and more narrow and bigoted in the seventeenth century—it lost the qualities of the earlier Puritanism. In New England, however, the spontaneity, enthusiasm and versatility of Elizabethan Puritanism were retained in the intense, transcendental ideals of the new world. "American vestiges of the Puritan spirit are Elizabethan still—springing straight from the integral elder days which mustered as well the imaginative masterpieces of poetry and of the drama." The American principle of ideality behind the law is a survival of the Elizabethan age.

This summary may serve to give some idea of Mr. Wendell's thesis, worked out with great ingenuity and much thought. Like most theses it is strained in places, but in the main the student will agree with it. The book is not so full an interpretation of seventeenth century literature as Professor Dowden's "Puritan and Anglican," but as a general survey of the whole period—giving unity to a great mass of details and tendencies—it is clearly one of the most successful books yet written on English literature. The style is in every sense admirable—except, perhaps, in a tendency to outdo Matthew Arnold in repeating phrases, and to use such words as "diuturnity." One very bad typographical error is seen in "Keat's," on page 59. E. M.

THE CLANSMAN. By Thomas Dixon, Jr. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1905,—374 pp.

THE LION'S SKIN. By John S. Wise. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1905,—404 pp.

Neither of these novels had its origin in the artistic impulse. One is the result of a purpose to glorify the Ku Klux Klan and to show the venom of men in the North, who after Lincoln's death established reconstruction governments in the South; the other is a brief for the political opinions held by a Southern Republican

after the war, who, on account of social ostracism, became a citizen of New York—an unwilling exile from his native State. The authors are alike in their attitude to the civil war, and in their glorification of Abraham Lincoln as the sympathetic friend of the South, whose untimely death was the beginning of a direful reign of terror in this section. They are alike, too, in their conception of the scalawag, the carpet-bagger, and the newly enfranchised negro—described by Mr. Wise as such “a gang of political rascallions as were never before seen in any civilized government.” At this point, however, they part company. Mr. Wise thinks that the danger of negro domination was not serious, at least in Virginia, which “never had, nor had she ever occasion for, the secret Ku Klux Klan, or any kindred organization.” There are in his book interesting sketches of life in Richmond and at the University of Virginia just after the war; but the last part of the book is largely a political pamphlet, setting forth the corruption and insincerity of the Democratic party in Virginia and the victory and final defeat of Mahone. The author is thoroughly aware of the inheritance by the South of political methods and social ideals engendered by opposition to reconstruction governments.

Mr. Dixon, on the other hand, giving his story the background of the Piedmont section of South and North Carolina—where the evils of reconstruction were especially pernicious—tells the story of the rise and growth of the Ku Klux Klan, which, in his opinion, was the means of saving Southern civilization. He compares them with the Knights of the Middle Ages who rode on their Holy Crusades; throws around the Klan the glamor of religious zeal, and sees in the deeds of these Scotch-Irish of the Carolinas the spirit of the Scotch Covenanters. The author has evidently thoroughly investigated all available sources to give local color to his story. He has gone at the task of presenting the entire contemporary spirit with his accustomed energy and zeal. He has reproduced the stirring times. If the results of his studies had appeared as a series of newspaper articles—say, in the *New York Journal*—one would perhaps have no serious complaint to urge. Indeed, one may say that the spirit of the book is better than that of the “Leopard’s Spots,” if for no other reason, because of the evident sincerity of his appreciation of the character of Lincoln.

But Mr. Dixon is not a successful novelist; one has only to compare him with Joel Chandler Harris or Thomas Nelson Page, who have both written reconstruction novels, to see the difference between men who have artistic power and a man who writes altogether with a purpose in view. The power of sustained creative effort, the charm of language, the art of managing conversation, the restraint of the artist—all these are foreign to him. The book is full of such sentences as this: "My politics is bounded on the North by a pair of amber eyes, on the South by a dimpled little chin, on the East and West by a rosy cheek." One may not have a very good opinion of Thaddeus Stevens and yet feel the absurdity of this characterization: "As the nostrils of the big three-angled nose dilated, the scream of an eagle rang in his voice, his huge, ugly hand held the crook of his cane with the clutch of a tiger, his tongue flew with the hiss of an adder, and his big, deformed foot seemed to grip the floor as the claw of a beast." The story is full of horrible situations—such, for instance, as the negro brute rehearsing the story of a crime that has already harrowed the feelings of the reader. The book might attain the sale of a million copies and yet not establish itself in the minds of critics as anything but a piece of melodramatic writing.

Does it accomplish any good? If so, one might pardon artistic defects. It stirs up prejudice in the minds of Southern people, who know the story of those awful days. A man who wishes to lead the Southern people in the right way should follow the great leaders of the South in allaying the bitter memories of the past. This point might be waived if it accomplished good in the North; it is written in such a spirit and with such an utter lack of art as to defeat this object. The answer to "Uncle Tom's Cabin" is not found here—it is in Page's "In Ole Virginia," Harris's "Uncle Remus," Miss Glasgow's remarkably fine novels, Robert E. Lee's letters, the speeches of Lamar and Grady. These have won and will win the good will of the North—the North that Mr. Mabie writes about in this number of the *QUARTERLY*. Finally, the effect of such books as Mr. Dixon's is to hinder very decidedly that better understanding of the negro problem that is now under way in all parts of the country. Mr. Dixon's attitude to the negro—notwithstanding what he may say about some individ-

uals of the race—is one of bitterness as to the past and pessimism as to the future.

The only excuse for the publication of such a book is that in a democracy there should be the opportunity for untrammelled expression of opinion. It is to be hoped that restorative and constructive forces, North and South, will make it impossible for its spirit to prevail in the national consciousness.

E. M.

THE TRUE HENRY CLAY. By Joseph M. Rogers. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1904,—388 pp.

If one wants some chatty incidents about several of our prominent Americans, let him peruse one of our "true" biographies. Mr. Paul Leicester Ford, who set the series a-going in his "True George Washington," meant a "true" life to be something more of an intimate personal life than the formal political biographies. From that standpoint his own book was a success. Many general readers will ever go to it for certain phases of Washington's life. But such a book cannot take the place of a political life. For example, what the world wants to know about is his part in American political life, his career as a statesman. They will need to have this career presented in the entirety, and by sections. It must logically, and somewhat chronologically, be unfolded for the reader. "The True Henry Clay" contains twenty-seven chapters, nearly everyone of which treats of some phase of character or occupation which ran through more than one period of Clay's life. The result is that over-lapping and confusion which proceeds from an excessive use of the topical method.

Mr. Rogers's book has the redeeming feature of being interesting. He has been able by his method to introduce a large number of anecdotes, and the career of Clay was rich in anecdotes. He presents his facts in a quick, nervous manner. The narratives always run, being rarely interrupted by philosophy. The impression produced on the student is, however, that there is a lack of balanced judgment in this. To take an illustration, one finds this statement in regard to the famous charges of 1825: "That there never was a corrupt bargain nor anything like it, is now accepted as certain, as undoubted as any fact in history" (p. 124). Now

a man with scientific sense of history would not have made this statement. He would not have been so positive in his conclusion; for John Quincy Adams's "Diary" makes it very probable that Clay's friends had reason to expect that Clay would be secretary of state before they voted for Adams.

Of small errors the book has its full share. It does not appear that Clay spent many years collecting evidence that the cry of bargain was false (p. 124), it is not accurate to say that Van Buren got the British mission because he took the side of Mrs. Eaton (p. 177). It seems a little unusual to say that Jackson vetoed the bill to recharter the bank in order to get the support of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia was the seat of the bank's greatest power, and it boded Jackson no good in Pennsylvania to veto the bank bill. His friends considered the act as of very doubtful propriety. Lastly one must note that the bank controversy has been treated in ignorance, as it appears, of the recent work on that subject by Professor Catterall.

J. S. BASSETT.

TRUSTS, POOLS AND CORPORATIONS. Edited with an Introduction by William Z. Ripley. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1905,—xxx., 477 pp.

Professor Ripley has inaugurated with this book a new series of volumes of "Selections and Documents in Economics." A similar volume on "Trade Unionism and Labor Problems" is in preparation by Professor Commons, one on "Sociology and Social Problems" by Professor Carver, and one on "Taxation and Public Finance" by Professor Bullock. Each volume in the new series is to be a collection of economic reprints, planned for use specifically as a text book supplementing the standard treatises. In the words of the editor, this new series "denotes a deliberate attempt at the application of the case system, so long successfully used in our law schools, to the teaching of economics. With this end in view, each chapter is intended to illustrate a single, definite, typical phase of the general subject." The concrete data so placed in convenient form at the disposal of the student will serve as "a basis for analysis, discussion and criticism."

The present volume is made up of reprints from the writings of such leading authorities upon trusts and corporations as Professor J. W. Jenks, Professor Ripley, Dr. Edward S. Meade, Hon.

P. C. Knox, and Hon. James Smith, Jr. As an instance of the method pursued, the over-capitalization of trusts is given a concrete illustration by the reprinting from the *Political Science Quarterly* of Dr. Meade's account of the capitalization of the International Mercantile Marine Company. Similarly, the report of Hon. James Smith, Jr., receiver of the United States Shipbuilding Company, is used to furnish a concrete instance of fraudulent finance. Such reprints and documents make admirable raw material for detailed class room study and the use of them will do much to give vital interest to economic instruction. The collection of such material, carefully edited and drawn from the most authoritative sources, will in the present volume, and doubtless in those to follow, afford substantial aid toward the application of improved methods to secure the effectiveness of economic teaching.

W. H. G.

LABOR PROBLEMS. By Thomas Sewall Adams and Helen L. Sumner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905,—xv., 579 pp.

This book has been written to furnish a convenient text for the study of American labor problems by undergraduate students. Its authors "have preferred to cover a broad field imperfectly, rather than a narrow field in detail." After an introductory chapter upon the "Genesis of the Labor Problem," Book I, under the sub-title "Evils," is made up of chapters upon the labor of women and children, upon immigration, the sweating system, and poverty and unemployment. Book II is entitled "Remedies" and is devoted to the consideration of strikes and boycotts, labor organizations and employers' associations, agencies of industrial peace, profit sharing, co-operation, industrial education, labor laws, and the material progress of the wage earning classes. There are valuable appendices on woman and child labor laws in the United States, profit sharing in the United States, and earnings and unemployment in 1901. Helpful lists of references and of supplementary readings are provided at the ends of chapters for those who wish to make detailed study of the various topics.

The authors of this work have performed a useful service in compressing into a single volume so large an amount of information upon a subject which is ever increasing in importance.

Besides its availability for use with college classes, their book will have a distinct value as a handy book of reference. As a book to be read from first chapter to last, it will not make a strong appeal, for, with the general reader, carefulness and good judgment will not atone for a colorless style and a lack of fresh interest.

W. H. G.

YALE INSURANCE LECTURES. Delivered in the Insurance Course at Yale University. 2 Volumes. Vol. I., Life Insurance. Vol. II., Fire Insurance and Miscellaneous. New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Press, 1904,—245 pp. and 357 pp.

Yale University, in the academic year 1903-4, inaugurated a new and unique course in insurance, consisting of an extended series of lectures on the several phases of the general subject delivered by experts and leaders in the insurance world. These lectures were at first published in the columns of the *Yale Alumni Weekly*, and have now been given more convenient and permanent form in two substantial volumes. The course aimed "to give the student such a knowledge of the fundamental principles of insurance and such a view of its extent and its methods of operation as would enable him to judge accurately of its power as an economic force, and would further prepare him for wise action when the duties of his profession or business required him to guard himself or others from possible loss. It was further intended to furnish a broad, preliminary view of insurance for those who intended to enter it later, either as a business or as a profession." Both of these aims were admirably carried out.

The resulting volumes will also be of great value to those who are already actively engaged in insurance work. The insurance agent who reads these lectures will gain a broad understanding of the subject which should add to his success in securing business. Broad knowledge of the fundamental principles of insurance should give intelligence and effectiveness to the presentation of the claims of a particular company. On the other hand, the individual who has acquired such knowledge will be better able to act wisely in choosing such a policy contract as will meet his particular needs.

The first volume is devoted to the subject of fire insurance. Among the many expert lecturers were John F. Dryden, John A.

McCall, and James W. Alexander. Besides a consideration of life insurance from the historical, economical, actuarial, and medical standpoints, there are accounts of office organization, the agency business, the investment of insurance funds, fraternal insurance, and government regulation of life insurance companies. The second volume gives equally authoritative discussions of fire insurance, marine insurance, accident insurance, liability insurance, steam boiler insurance, corporate surety bonding, government insurance and insurance law. W. H. G.

LITERARY NOTES

The Library of Congress, through its Manuscripts Division, has undertaken to publish in a number of volumes the Journal of the Continental Congress. This edition is to be based on the original manuscript, which has never before been fully published. The supervision of Mr. Worthington Chauncey Ford, chief of the division, is guarantee that no pains will be spared to make the work all that modern scholarship requires. The first volume, which deals with the year 1774, meets these expectations. It is a most careful piece of editing and printing. The notes which Mr. Ford has supplied from many sources, include marginal notes on the original manuscript, and memoranda from labels and wrappers. The first volume contains 143 pages and eleven illustrations.

The Third Annual Report of the Department of Archives and History of the State of Mississippi has just been issued by Mr. Dunbar Rowland, director of the department. It contains 259 pages and includes in eight appendices some valuable reprints of early Mississippi material. Among these are "Documents concerning the Aaron Burr Conspiracy, from the Journal of Cowles Mead;" and material from the journals of Governors W. C. C. Claiborne, Winthrop Sargent, Robert Williams, and David Holmes. The report shows that the director has planned the work of his department on the lines of public documents and manuscripts. If this course is pursued continuously it ought to yield much valuable history for the State and for the Southwest generally.

Professor Felix E. Schelling, of the University of Pennsylvania, who has in his "Book of Elizabethan Lyrics," and "Poetic and Verse Criticism of the Reign of Elizabeth," proved himself to be a scholarly and discerning critic of Elizabethan literature, has now gathered together a volume of entertaining and instructive sketches—mere "waifs and strays" of his weightier studies in the literature of the age of Elizabeth and James. The volume bears the title of "The Queen's Progress and Other Elizabethan

Sketches." It comes from the press of Houghton, Mifflin & Co., and both in print and illustration is an excellent example of book-making.

"The Biennial Report and Recommendations of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of North Carolina to Gov. Charles B. Aycock for the scholastic years 1902-3 and 1903-4," is a pamphlet of great interest to all who wish to know the substantial progress made in North Carolina in educational work. It emphasizes anew the superior work done by ex-Governor Aycock and Superintendent Joyner in arousing enthusiasm for public education and—what is better—in accomplishing tangible and far-reaching results. Some of the noteworthy facts are: that there has been an increase of 7.8 per cent. in the white enrollment and 6.9 per cent. in the colored enrollment during the past two years; that there has been an increase of 2.34 weeks in length of white school term and of 2.3 weeks in length of colored school during the past four years; that there are now 877 rural libraries; that 150 local tax districts have been established during the past two years; that consolidation of school districts, county supervision and the organization and systematization of the work have all been steadily advanced. The superintendent's recommendations indicate a liberal policy for the future; it is interesting to note that the legislature, just adjourned, carried out many of them. His words on the education of the negro were heeded and North Carolina has fortunately escaped any danger of Vardamanism. Under the careful supervision of Mr. Charles L. Coon, there may be expected a decided improvement in the colleges and schools of the negro race. Mr. Joyner has the co-operation and best wishes of all friends of education in his work during the next four years.

The January number of the *Sewanee Review*, appearing as it does with improved mechanical features, emphasizes once more the sterling quality of this magazine, now in its thirteenth year. The improvement in its get up is due to the superior work of the University Press which will henceforth print the magazine and do other publishing work. The publication of the late Bishop Quintard's "Memories of War" is announced for April. The *Review* presents an interesting table of contents, notably, "The

Servant Problem in a Black Belt Village," by Walter L. Fleming; "Hamlet's Mouse Trap," by Henry Thew Stephenson; "The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer," by William S. Bishop; "Swinburne's Poetic Theories and Practice," by E. G. Hoffsten; "The Influence of Fergusson on Burns," by W. L. Myers; and "Thomas U. Dudley," by William P. Du Bose. The high standard of articles established by Professor Trent and now maintained by Professor Henneman is one of the most encouraging facts in contemporary Southern life.

Southern men are to write four out of the twenty-eight volumes in the series on "The American Nation," being published under the editorship of Professor Albert Bushnell Hart. President Lyon Gardiner Tyler, of William and Mary College, is the author of the volume on "England in America." Professor John Spencer Bassett, of Trinity College, will write on "The Federalist System;" Professor George Pierce Garrison, of the University of Texas, on "Westward Expansion," and Professor John Holladay Latané, of Washington and Lee University, on "America the World Power."

The published report of the Hampton Negro Conference of 1904 contains matter of great interest and value and must make upon the reader a strong impression of the social importance of the work being performed by this agency. There are included in the report many striking papers on such topics as "The Negro and Life Insurance," "Negro Women and Domestic Service," "The Negro Death Rate—Especially from Tuberculosis."

Mr. Thomas Nelson Page's "The Negro: The Southerner's Problem" (Charles Scribner's Sons), and Professor W. B. Smith's "The Color Line" (McClure, Phillips & Co.), are two very significant and important books on the everlasting negro problem. They will be treated in an extended review in the July number of the QUARTERLY. On account of a misunderstanding the article which was to have appeared in this number had to be delayed.

Professor Albert S. Cook is doing a genuine service for students of English literature by bringing out a series of Yale Studies in English (Henry Holt & Co., New York). Himself a prolific writer

and an untiring investigator, he is stimulating the spirit of scholarly research in the minds of his students. The latest books—numbers 27 and 28 in the series—are editions of Ben Jonson's "Poetaster" and "The Staple of News"—the first by Herbert S. Mallory, instructor in English at Yale, and the second by De Winter, instructor in rhetoric at Yale. Both of them are doctorate dissertations. Each play is carefully edited as to text and has an introduction, notes, bibliography and glossary which give evidence at once of scientific methods and literary appreciation.

Dr. John Porter Hollis, Acting Professor of History and Economics in Southwestern University, Texas, is the author of a monograph upon "The Early Period of Reconstruction in South Carolina" in the series of Johns Hopkins University Studies.

Dr. Paul Skeels Peirce has recently published a monograph on "The Freedmen's Bureau" in the University of Iowa Studies in Sociology, Economics, Politics and History.

